3 1761 08117946 7

THE JEWISH REVIEW

DITED BY
ORMAN BENTWICH
AND
DR JOSEPH HOCHMAN

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Editorials: The Jewish Review. The Jewish Religious Union. The Ninth Zionist Congress. The Conference of Anglo-Jewish Ministers. Perez Smolensky		1
"Passover"—A Sonnet .	*Horace Samuel*	16
Græco-Roman Criticism of Some Jewish Observances and Beliefs . .	*Dr. A. Büchler*	17
A Letter from Heine .	*Elkan Adler,* M.A.	30
The Pogroms . . .	*H. Sacher*	35
Pragmatism and Religion .	*Dr. A. Wolf*	[illegible]
A Reform of Judaism upon a Nationalist Basis.	*Dr. L. Magnes, New York*	54
The "Free Jewish Organisation."	*Dr. Elbogen, Berlin*	64
The Jewish Territorial Organisation.	*H. M. Kisch,* C.S.I.	68
Zionism after the Ninth Congress .	*Leon Simon*	74
Reviews of Books: The Synoptic Gospels. Spinoza, etc.		81

Vol. I. No. 1. April, 1910 PRICE 1/6 NET.

ONDON:—GEO. ROUTLEDGE & SONS

AGAINST SOCIALISM

Nietzsche is a great and growing force, a healthy antidote to modern sentiment. Superman is his ideal, strong and powerful in comparison with the flabbiness of present-day ideals, courageous to the point of hardness, able to rule, not because he will, but because he must. He will be just to the weak, but will not pity them. Uprightness and truthfulness are his first virtues.

NIETZSCHE

NEW COMPLETE EDITION OF WORKS. Edited by Dr. OSCAR LEVY.

In 18 volumes, crown 8vo, cloth. The only complete and authorised edition in English. *Ready*:

I. THOUGHTS OUT OF SEASON. Vol. I. With Editor's Preface, and Introduction. 230 pp 2s. 6d. net.
II. THOUGHTS OUT OF SEASON. Vol. II. Translated, with Introduction, by A. COLLINS, M.A. 214 pp. 2s. 6d. net.
III. THE BIRTH OF TRAGEDY. With Introduction by Mrs. FORSTER-NIETZSCHE, the Philosopher's sister, and Portrait. 230 pp. 2s. 6d. net.
IV. THUS SPAKE ZARATHUSTRA. With Introduction by Mrs. FORSTER-NIETZSCHE and Commentary. 490 pp. 6s. net.
V. BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL. Translated by HELEN ZIMMERN. With Introduction by THOMAS COMMON. 276 pp. 3s. 6d. net.
[J. M. KENNEDY. 182 pp. 2s. 6d. net.
VI. THE FUTURE OF OUR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS. Translated, with Introduction, by
VII. THE WILL TO POWER. Vol. I. Translated, with Introduction, by A. M. LUDOVICI. 430 pp. 5s. net.
VIII. HUMAN, ALL-TOO-HUMAN. Vol. I. Translated by HELEN ZIMMERN. 410 pp. 5s. net.
IX. THE GENEALOGY OF MORALS. Translated, with Introduction, by HORACE B. SAMUEL, M.A. 3s. 6d. net.
WHO IS TO BE MASTER OF THE WORLD? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Nietzsche by A. M. LUDOVICI. Preface by Dr. OSCAR LEVY. 200 pp. 2s. 6d. net.

Complete List of Nietzsche Books, post free. T. N. FOULIS, 21 Paternoster Square, E.C.

ASPECTS OF THE HEBREW GENIUS.

Crown 8vo, Cloth. 2s. 6d. net.

1. PHILO. By NORMAN BENTWICH.
2. SAADIAH. By M. SIMON.
3. MAIMONIDES. By Rev. H. S. LEWIS.
4. JEWISH CODES & CODIFIERS. By Dr. S. DAICHES.
5. ARISTOTLE & MEDIÆVAL JEWISH THOUGHT. By Dr. A. WOLF.
6. JEWISH MYSTICISM. By H. SPERLING.
7. THE JEWISH NEW LEARNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By M. H. SEGAL.

With Introduction by Mr. ELKAN N. ADLER.

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED, 68–74 CARTER LANE, LONDON, E.C.

FOR HIGH CLASS

TYPEWRITING

Sho rising

Th

MISS COLEMAN,

SOLICITORS' AND GENERAL TYPEWRITING CO.,

68B Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.

Telephone: 3009 Holborn. *4 doors from Kingsway.*

LIBRARY
JUN 5 1972
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

The Jewish Review

Nisan 5670. Vol. I. No. 1. April 1910

Editorials

The aim of *The Jewish Review* is to provide a platform for the discussion of Jewish questions in a critical and scientific spirit. The weekly Jewish Press is bound to deal in large part with the passing events of the Anglo-Jewish community, and cannot, on the one hand, devote much attention to Jewish literature and culture, nor, on the other, treat fully of larger movements which affect the whole Jewish people. There is need of a separate organ to fulfil these two functions, and it is the design of this Review to meet the need. For twenty years *The Jewish Quarterly Review* provided a means for the publication in England of articles dealing with Jewish scholarship and Jewish theology, and it is about to start a new lease of life in America. But its aim and appeal were, and are, somewhat different from that of our enterprise. Jewish scholarship and theology will have a place in our programme, but by no means an exclusive place; we are concerned even more especially with the living problems of the present, and with the bearing of their solution on the future. Our articles, moreover, will, we hope, be at once scientific and popular, written with special knowledge, but intelligible to the general reader. In the range of interests which our Review will cover, there is nothing to prevent the combination of accurate thought and attractive treatment. The Review will be catholic in the sense that it will deal with all Jewish questions which concern the whole of the Jewish people, or one particular Jewish community. But at the same time it will have a distinctive outlook. In its religious views it will be frankly conservative, and in dealing with religious, as with other problems, it will hold fast to a conception of the Jewish people as a religious nationality. We stand for traditional Judaism, recognising the progressive spirit that characterised the Rabbinic teaching, with which the traditional Judaism of our day stands in the direct line of historical development. It follows as a corollary from this view that in treating of the political, social, and economic questions affecting Jews, we stand for a conception of the Jewish people as one people with a common history in the past, with a common ideal for the future, and with living problems in the present which they must endeavour to solve in unison. That conception formed the fundamental motive of the foundation of the Alliance Israélite, the Anglo-Jewish Association, and the Hilfsverein; it receives, perhaps, unpremeditated expression in the continuous activity of those societies, and it is more directly and more consciously proclaimed by the Zionist and Territorialist movements.

The editorial section of each number, which will give a survey of current Jewish events, will uphold these positions; but articles which take up a different standpoint will not be excluded from the Review. We owe no allegiance to any party organisation or religious section, and we shall close our pages to no serious opinion. We invite contributions representative of all views, provided, first, that they deal with general questions and not with those of only local and momentary importance; and, secondly, that they are written in a scientific spirit. We shall give a proper representation to studies of Jewish life in other countries, but every article will appear in English. On the other side of the Review we hope to publish in each number at least one article bearing upon some part of Jewish literature or Jewish history, and a consideration of modern Jewish culture will have its place side by side with an appreciation of the old. We shall regularly include reviews of books that deal with the past, the present, or the future of the Jewish people, or with some aspect of Judaism. Our criticism will endeavour to be critical and independent.

We hope that a Review conducted upon these lines will command the support of English-speaking Jews. It is certainly desirable that serious opinion should be focussed upon the important questions which confront our people to-day. English and American Jewry wield a large influence in the control of Jewish affairs all the world over; but at present they are not worthily represented in the field of Jewish thought. The Review will endeavour to do something for the formation of Jewish opinion, as well as something for the spread of knowledge of Jewish achievement. Our function will be to provide the means for these objects; it is for the Jewish communities in the English-speaking countries to fit the means to the end. With some trepidation, but with confidence in the goodness of our aim and the goodwill of our public we offer them our first number as an earnest of our intentions.

The Jewish Religious Union

The Jewish Religious Union has now changed its name and objects. It is being reorganised as "The Jewish Religious Union for the Advancement of Liberal Judaism," in order that it may be brought into line with the similar unions in France and Germany. It no longer stands as a half-way house to win the indifferent for the synagogue, but seeks to call them—and others—to a synagogue of its own, in which universalist doctrines are to be emphasised and separatist ceremonials suppressed. Its spokesman recognises "that the Jewish Religion is not only a historical religion in the sense that Christianity is a historical religion. It is also the religion of a particular race." None the less, he desires "that no religious ceremonial be maintained which does not possess in addition to its national or racial quality a religious quality as well." Judaism is a universal religion. Liberal Jews therefore demand that all barriers of separatism be broken down. For the Liberal Jew observances are religious only if they are universally acceptable. In effect this was the attitude adopted by Holdheim sixty years ago, when he sought to remove from Judaism all its national elements, and those elements were marked out as national which, not being universally acceptable, were found burdensome and disagreeable. But to remove the national element from Judaism is to remove its foundation. For although we can undoubtedly all agree "that its doctrines are not suited to one race, but might be the common belief of all races," we cannot draw from this premise the inference that Judaism must therefore be acceptable by all, in its ceremonials, as well as in its doctrines, without thereby proclaiming our estrangement from the spirit of Judaism and giving to the word "religion" a connotation which is not Jewish. The basis of religion in Judaism is not creed, but law, so that it seemed to Moses Mendelssohn to be "not a revealed religion, but a revealed legislation." Its *raison d'être* is the maintenance of a society of Jews in which the Jewish outlook and the Jewish belief shall develop. Whereas in Christianity advancing knowledge produces the change in creed that promotes the multiplication of sects, Judaism is as patient of advancing knowledge as it has shown itself impatient of all sectarianism. Whereas in the Christian world there are elements in every national life which are non-religious, and religious observances which are not national, in Judaism no national element is non-religious, and every religious observance is national. The organic union of religion, law, and nationality is characteristic of Judaism. Therein it delivers its message to the world, and can, by its example alone, strive towards the achievement of its ideal in the general realisation of that union.

When the leaders of the Jewish Religious Union demand a separate synagogue, in which the universalist doctrines of Judaism and the " Mission of Israel " shall be emphasised, and the national elements of which these doctrines are born eliminated, they proclaim a conception of religion which is anti-Jewish, and betray that assimilation in thought which must herald assimilation in life. Once make creed the basis of religious organisation, and the religious society that results is unstable. Every varying shade of opinion will justify desertion, and lead on to the promotion of new sects or absorption into existing churches.

Of Jewish reform it is true that *plus ça change plus c'est la même chose.* Whether its alleged motive is a desire to purify Judaism of supposed superstitious excrescences, or to denationalise it, or to accommodate it to the teachings of (Christian) Higher Criticism, always and everywhere its true inwardness is the impulse towards assimilation, towards the breaking down of the separateness of the Jewish people. With the leaders of the movement in England, as well as in Germany, the motive may be unconscious: with their followers it is conscious and dominant. They join the union not because of the intensity of their religious feeling, but because of the decay of their Jewish consciousness. Claiming to be a modification of traditional Judaism to suit new circumstances and to harmonise with modern ideas, Liberal Judaism has been, in Germany and in America, and is already in England, a shaky bridge between the synagogue and the Church. We are not concerned with the aspirations of the spokesmen of the new development in England. They may sincerely hope to combat indifference by secession; they may honestly believe in " the homœopathic cure for irreligion "; they may think that by reducing the claims of Judaism on the individual, they will increase his loyalty to the creed of his fathers. The personal aspirations of individual reformers are immaterial;

we must look to the direction in which their views tend, and judge of their validity by such experience as we have. Looking, then, at the direction of Liberal Judaism in other countries, we see that it has led to the weakening of belief, to the abandonment of practice, and to direct apostacy. Its pioneers, as Dr. Nordau said in his recent summary of Jewish history in the nineteenth century, established "Churches without Crosses, which are euphemistically called Temples," while their followers, finding these cold and unsatisfying, have passed on to Ethical Culture and Christian Science.

Is there anything in the English development which suggests a different outcome? If anything, the secession from the synagogue is here more insidious. Though, perhaps, more moderate in his expression than his predecessors in Germany or America, the leader of the Union here adopts the same tone of opposition to traditional Judaism, which according to him has more of error than truth; he displays a more pronounced Jesuolatry; he has no firm anchorage in the past, neither in the Bible, nor in tradition, and no fixed point in the present; but he floats about in an unreasoning eclecticism in matters of belief, and an unconvinced selection of ceremonial which is based on vague sentiment or expediency. It is disquieting also that the orator whom the Union brought over from America to propagate its principles is a man distinguished even in the United States for his repudiation of every traditional bond of Judaism. Possibly the programme of the Union may hold its immediate members in some kind of tie with the Jewish community; but does any honest man doubt that it will fail to hold their offspring? Religion and nationality have been woven together in traditional Judaism for nearly three thousand years as warp and woof in cloth. They cannot be severed without destroying the fabric. In England, indeed, the attempt to denationalise Judaism and to liberate it from the law is the more dangerous because here the assimilation of the Jew has not to encounter the opposition of the non-Jew. The social bar erected by anti-Semitism is the last bulwark which the most Liberal Judaism abroad has not yet contrived to storm. There the Liberalism is all on one side; in England the road which leads to absorption and the Church is easier to traverse.

The leaders of the Jewish Religious Union, by their rejection of law and nationality, are leading away a stream from the living fountain of Judaism to lose itself in the arid plains of universalism.

The Zionist Congress

The ninth Zionist Congress bore witness to the abiding enthusiasm of the Zionists, whose representatives came together at Hamburg from all parts of the world, in the dead of winter, to discuss the position and policy of the movement. The far-reaching influence which Zionism has won compels the attention of every Jew to its progress. For thirteen years the Zionists have striven to secure "a publicly recognised, legally assured home for the Jewish people in Palestine"; but the Revolution in Turkey called for a Reformation in Zionism. Herzl's programme involved opposition to the activity of the Chovevi Zion, which was closely associated in England with the name of the late Colonel Goldsmid, and which aimed at creating small settlements of Jewish colonists in Palestine. The Chovevi Zion, indeed, sought to foster the Jewish national consciousness against assimilative tendencies; but though it hoped for the gradual establishment of a Jewish population in Palestine large enough to affect the pressing problem of Jewish congestion in lands of persecution, the creation of a Jewish State was no part of its avowed programme. Herzl aimed at a Jewish occupation of Palestine *en masse,* and demanded a financial instrument from the Jews to make it possible, a charter from the Sultan to render it legal, and a guarantee from the Powers to secure it. He regarded as wasteful any activities in Palestine prior to the fulfilment of these conditions, and therefore opposed the work of the Chovevi Zion. The ninth Congress showed that with the passage of time the methods of the Chovevi Zion are regaining favour with the Zionists. The overthrow of despotic government and the establishment of a constitutional régime in Turkey have made superfluous the guarantee of the Powers for the security of Jewish settlers in Palestine. The charter which was to secure political autonomy for the settlers has become needless in an empire governed by elected representatives. Though the Congress agreed to leave the form of Herzl's programme unaltered, the words "a publicly recognised, legally assured home" mean henceforth a home assured by the goodwill of the Ottoman people, and the demand for autonomy is explicitly abandoned. Thus far Zionists are agreed. While, however, one section—the Conservatives, we may call them—desires that the funds of the movement be still allowed to accumulate until organised colonisation on a large scale can be undertaken in Palestine, and that diplomatic negotiations be meanwhile continued for removing what legal and political obstacles stand in the way, another section—the Progressives—demands that the capital already collected and continually growing should be immediately invested in industrial and agricultural enterprises in Palestine. They have full confidence in the present régime for the security of such undertakings and of the growing population which would be attracted to the country. Both parties find common ground in the expansion of educational facilities for the Jews already settled in Palestine; and this common ground could, we believe, be shared not only by all sections of Zionists, but also by non-Zionists.

For the deeper motives of Zionism are independent of the economic and political considerations which some of its critics seem to regard as the sole measure of its progress. Mr. Zangwill has recently insisted that "Palestinian Zionism is already bankrupt as a practical political solution of the Jewish question," because Palestine could at best only hold a fraction of the Jewish people. Zionism, however, seeks no more, since its highest aim is but the creation of a home for Jewish life under healthy Jewish conditions. That home is being built up before our eyes, and work on behalf of the schools in the land, which are making Hebrew a living language again, may surely command general support without consideration of the numbers that the country may receive.

The ninth Congress, if the least conclusive, has shown that despite the loss of the commanding personality of its founder, the Zionist movement records a growing extension and an adaptability to changing conditions, explicable only on the supposition of permanent forces which foster its progress and secure its durability. Despite the opposition of leading Jews it has won the goodwill of many non-Jewish statesmen. Despite the aloofness of Jewish capitalists it has amassed a fund of about half a million sterling from the pence of the Jewish people, the poorest proletariat of the world. Despite dissensions in its own camp it has already founded several institutions, financial and educational, which are making Palestine once more a centre of Jewish culture. It is to be noted that though the great stream of Jewish emigration goes westwards, Palestine receives each year its tithe, and has now 100,000 Jewish inhabitants. And while emigration to other countries involves a complication of Jewish problems, in Palestine it means the strengthening of Jewish culture. The Turkish Minister of Education recently stated in an interview with the editor of the *Aurore*, that his Government would place no obstacle in the way of Palestinian Jews continuing to use Hebrew as their national language. Zionists have reason to read the signs of the times in their own favour.

The abandonment of the Jewish State idea should put an end once for all to the misconception that Zionism lays open to question the patriotism of Jews to the lands of their allegiance. On the other hand, the revival of the East may render Palestine the centre of the world again, and give to the Jews living there another opportunity of delivering the religious message for which the world is hungering. The greatest excellence of Zionism is its spiritual appeal. It has won, and is winning, for Jewish interests many who were lost to, and drifting away from, Judaism; it has brought a living ideal alike to the wretched Ghettos of Eastern Europe and to the materialised Jewries of the West; its greatest aspiration for the future is that, by fostering the growth of a Jewish population speaking the language of the prophets in the land of the prophets, it may create a centre of intellectual activity in a truly Jewish environment, from which may go forth a living message and a distinctively Jewish outlook on life to enrich the spiritual wealth of mankind.

The Conference of Anglo-Jewish Ministers

The celebration of the Chief Rabbi's seventieth birthday, in June of last year, brought to London a number of ministers from all parts of the United Kingdom. At the instance of the *Jewish Chronicle* they availed themselves of the opportunity to arrange for the Conference which was held at the end of December, and discussed a number of questions of religious practice and organisation. Another link has thus been forged between metropolitan and provincial congregations, and the first step has been taken towards overcoming the isolation in which members of the Anglo-Jewish ministry have hitherto been working. Their hands will be strengthened by the assistance which the mere exchange of views must render, and personal contact will no doubt help to bring about a better co-ordination of activities and greater unity of purpose than has hitherto been possible.

The Conference has yet to establish itself as an institution of Anglo-Jewry; and its durability, as well as its efficiency, must depend on the statesmanship with which its relations to existing institutions are adjusted. The tasks with which it is faced are as delicate as they are difficult, and much patience will be needed if it is ever to gain the influence which similar institutions abroad have won after long experience. The Rabbinical conferences in America date back to 1869, and in Germany to 1837. On the other hand, this was, to quote from the Chief Rabbi's opening address, " the first time that ministers and synagogue officials from wellnigh all parts of the United Kingdom " met together. It may indeed be said with equal truth that though there have been conferences of Rabbis, or conferences of elected representatives of Jewish congregations, this was the first time in the whole course of Jewish history that a conference consisting of " ministers and synagogue officials " has been held.

The tree is known by the fruit thereof. The unique character of the membership of the Conference of Anglo-Jewish ministers reveals the fact that the religious organisation of Anglo-Jewry is of a character distinct from that of any other Jewry in the world, now or heretofore. Our religious organisation must affect our religious life, and we may not ignore the fact that it is peculiar. Had the gathering done no more than bring this to light it would have rendered us no insignificant service. The Conference proclaimed itself experimental, and so could not be expected closely to study a matter of such far-reaching consequence, though it did discuss the related question of the "titles, functions, and status of the Jewish minister." The very use of the word "minister" is, however, peculiar to Anglo-Jewry, and is no doubt in a measure responsible for the peculiar composition of the Conference. The Conference was deliberative and did not pass resolutions; yet in framing the constitution of future conferences it decided that the word "minister" be omitted from the titles qualifying to membership, indicating that it was conscious of a difficulty involved which it will no doubt endeavour to solve.

The Conference, unfortunately, met some little time before the publication of the report of the select committee of the United Synagogue upon Jews' College. Had it been able to consider that document, which revealed the wide difference between the conception of the minister entertained by the lay leaders of the Anglo-Jewish community and the traditional ideal of the Rabbi, it might have raised an effective protest against the recommendation of a "saving ignorance" of Jewish learning, and against the degradation of the position of the wise and honoured teacher of the community to that of a combined preacher, synagogue official, and charity visitor. We look to the Conference as well as to Jews' College in future to save us from all that tends to the production of a peculiar order of Anglo-Jewish ministers and a consequently peculiar Anglican Judaism. Different as the conditions may be in which Jews in different countries live, the upholders of traditional Judaism must everywhere endeavour to maintain the unity, if not the uniformity, of Judaism. The responsibility of the Conference in this regard will grow less as it brings the religious organisation of Anglo-Jewry into line with that of other Jewish communities.

Were our English conference more in keeping with the Rabbinical conferences abroad, the absence of organic union between it and the general community, which would then be paralleled, would be matter of slight concern. The position of the Rabbi is defined. He is a master of Jewish science, and Rabbinic conferences discuss questions of his science in theory and application. The position of the minister, however, is undefined. If it were a gathering of specialists, the Conference could rely on the confidence of the public in matters that call for special knowledge. If a body of elected representatives, it would concern itself with the interests of its electors. Without such qualifications and corresponding confidence, it may tend to become self-centred; and a serious danger faces us in the possible emphasis of the distinction between clergy and laity, a distinction which is entirely foreign to the spirit of Jewish teaching. A Rabbinic conference is at present not possible in England because Anglo-Jewry—leaving aside the Sefardim—has hitherto recognised but one Rabbi; and the communal organisation as at present constituted tends to centralise authority in the person of the Chief Rabbi, who has himself drawn attention to the fact that the community has outgrown a system which was originally called into being to serve the needs of a few London synagogues. The discussion on "District Organisation of Provincial Congregations," showed that communal reorganisation is far more urgent than ministerial organisation. It is also a task to which no one section of the community can set itself alone. Under existing circumstances many difficulties would be avoided if the "Conference of Anglo-Jewish Ministers," or whatever it is in future to be called, would convert itself into a body of elected representatives of clergy and laity. Meanwhile, the more completely ministers identify their interests with those of the community, the more surely will they be building on Jewish foundations, and the more surely will they secure the solidarity of the Anglo-Jewish community, not only in its different parts, but in relation to the whole congregation of Israel.

Perez Smolensky

The 16th Shebat, the twenty-sixth of January of this year, was the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of Perez Smolensky, one of the many Jews who starved their way to fame. His name, we fear, means little to English readers. His strong personality was, however, the fountain-head of many a thought-wave that now powerfully influences our world-wide Jewry. Towards the end of the first half of the last century, the Russian Government sought for a little to bring within the reach of the Jews of Russia the general culture which the Jews of Germany had made their own. Smolensky—orphaned at the age of ten—set himself assiduously to the study of the Russian language, which the Government had made obligatory in the Yeshiba (Rabbinical College) to which he was sent; and at the same time devoted himself zealously to the study of the new Hebrew literature, though decried as a heretic and persecuted. After Moses Mendelssohn, Hebrew literature ceased to be a purely religious literature; but in the half-century that elapsed between the time of the *Meassef*, a periodical founded by friends of Mendelssohn, and the appearance of the *Hashachar*, which Smolensky founded, little appeared in Hebrew that could rank as enduring literature. Modern Jewish learning was producing works of importance mainly in German, but Hebrew writings, like those of Krochmal and Rappaport, were growing ever rarer. Smolensky, though urged to devote his pen to Russian literature, was fired with zeal for the Hebrew tongue and the Jewish people. He gathered around him a company of brilliant contributors, some of whom have held, one of whom still holds, high rank in European universities. In the twelve years' life of the *Hashachar* Smolensky and his collaborators proved the vitality of the Hebrew language and gave the world a truly modern, many-sided Hebrew literature, which continues to grow apace.

Alexander I, when asked what he imagined would be the cost of his endeavour to bring enlightenment to the Jews, replied that he would count any cost small which would produce a Mendelssohn in Russia. Possibly the wholesale apostasy and lingering assimilation of the generation that succeeded Mendelssohn was the real prize sought by the Russian Government, which in the 'eighties used other means to achieve its end—means that outraged the conscience of the civilised world. Smolensky suspected the end. He held Mendelssohn responsible for the "assimilation" of his successors, and sought to drag him from the pedestal on which general esteem had placed him. It was a necessary misdirection of courage. A man was needed who, while condemning the fanatical orthodoxy that was blind to every new idea, would yet struggle against fanatical reformers for whom all was obsolete and outworn that was peculiar to Jews. Reformers sheltered behind the fame of Mendelssohn; and Smolensky attacked their stronghold. He recognised that the trend of Mendelssohn's teaching made for assimilation, and he opposed the direction. Mendelssohn sought to bring the light of the world's wisdom to the Jews. Smolensky demanded enlightenment for the Jewish people from within. Mendelssohn sought to familiarise the Jews with the German language and he, the Ghetto Jew, gave to Germany the classical standard for German prose. Smolensky strove to familiarise Jews with the Hebrew tongue and gave his people a living Hebrew language. After the lapse of a quarter of a century the ideas for which Smolensky worked have so influenced the Jewish mind, that it is becoming ever more possible for Jews in every country to think in a Jewish way, though they may not be able to explain their thoughts in the Hebrew tongue which he so dearly loved.

Passover

SEE at the feast of freedom loll each slave,
Yea, see them from the East unto the West
Now celebrate with automatic zest
That antique triumph; see them swagger, brave
With verbal prayers a verbal Zion to save,
Who yet prefer the fleshpots to the quest,
While smug content inflates the bloated breast,
And glib they pray for what they do not crave.

See, too, these others: poorer, yet too proud
To hug those golden bonds which crib and hem,
Fording the sullen gulf with their desire,
Massing their dreams into a guiding cloud,
As points their vanward torch of pillared fire
The growing vision of Jerusalem.

HORACE B. SAMUEL.

Græco-Roman Criticism of Some Jewish Observances and Beliefs *

Modern Christian and Jewish writers, dealing with the Judaism of the first century, frequently refer to the unfavourable impression which Jews and Judaism produced on cultured Greeks and Romans of that time. Christian scholars like to draw the inference that Jewish religious life in and about the times of Jesus must have appeared, and must actually have been, ridiculous in many respects. It is hardly our duty to defend our religious practice in the past against the attacks of writers of the first century, and we could easily dispose of the light remarks of malignant critics. But it is undoubtedly a serious duty of historical research to ascertain the facts and conditions that occasioned the jeers of those enlightened authors, and to trace how far actual Jewish life laid itself open to the ready malice of Greek and Roman writers. Apart from this, it is also useful to know how others saw us. We are unable to see our own dark sides; and being, by life and belief, too closely connected with our own religion, we are apt to minimise, or even to deny, some features and aspects of Judaism which appear to outsiders serious weaknesses.

1. When reading statements of Greek and Roman writers about Judaism, our first question will naturally be, whether those authors took the trouble to watch the religious life of the Jews living in their midst before describing and ridiculing some Jewish customs and practices. And if they did so, whether they divested themselves and their minds of heathen ideas, at least

---

* Presidential address read to the Jews' College Literary Society on February 5th, 1910.

for a while, in order to try to understand and to appreciate Jewish religious thought and practice. Religion is now, and always was, in the first instance a matter of sentiment and feeling, and at that stage and in that form not accessible to the observation of the outsider. A non-Jew only sees his Jewish neighbour perform some strange acts of religion, but does not see the idea which it embodies, nor the feeling that actuates and accompanies it, nor the educational influence on the mind of the Jew. A sympathetic non-Jew, anxious to ascertain the presence of sincerity in the Jewish religious performance, will seek and will easily find many an opportunity of revealing a connection between outward observance and inner piety and genuine feeling. An unsympathetic non-Jew, on the other hand, being prejudiced against the Jew, will at once criticise his religion, without attempting to get a knowledge of at least the elements of it. He will apply ideas of pagan belief and worship as a measure and standard to Judaism, and will draw a slighting comparison between the one God of Jewish belief and the many gods of the Greek and Roman hierarchy. The worship of one invisible God appears to him ridiculous ; praying to God in heaven is a worship of the clouds ; all that justly formed and still constitutes the greatest pride of the Jewish religious genius was to the Greek and Roman critic of Judaism superstition, lack of religion, and deficiency of religious spirit. The Jews were even accused of atheism, because they refused to worship the respective gods of the cities in which they lived ; and because they persistently refused to sacrifice to the image of the Roman emperor, they were charged with lack of patriotism. The Greek and Roman authors and historians, in their utter inability to understand Judaism, preferred stories invented by oriental Greek anti-Semites to personal observation and investigation. Pompey, the Roman general, brought the news home that on entering the Holy of Holies of the Temple in Jerusalem he found no image of the Jewish God in it. The Roman historians inferred from this that the Jews had some uncertain or no god. They heard that the Jews refused to eat the flesh of the swine, and their spirit of ingenuity and of historical truth inspired them with a perverse idea of the historical origin of the Jewish custom. Petronius tells us that the Jews worshipped the god of the swine; and Plutarch made the inquiry the special subject of a learned symposium whether the Jewish abstention from swine flesh was due to the worship of this animal that taught the Jews agriculture, or to the leprosy of their ancestors when coming out from Egypt, or to an aversion towards the animal on account of its leprosy. How this kind of doctrine helped the Greek and Roman historians to understand and to characterise Judaism, it is hardly necessary to emphasise.

2. There was an additional reason which rendered it almost impossible for the Greek and Roman writers to give an objective account of Jews and Judaism. They were, in the first instance, Greeks and Romans, inflated with the blinding pride of chauvinism, and regarding anybody who happened to be born outside Greece or Italy as a wretched barbarian. They represented the victorious Roman Empire as against the conquered and destroyed country Judæa. They could not understand that a people might be small in numbers and in power, might even be crushed under the heel of Roman legions, and yet dare retain its old national religion and consider it superior to the religion of Rome. To the Roman mind the conquest of a country was tantamount to a defeat of its gods, and it was understood that the subdued province surrendered its gods to the conqueror. The Jew, however, continued to practise his religion, not only in Judæa, but even in Rome in the very sight of his Roman masters and their many gods.

We are apt to wrong one of Rome's greatest writers and orators, Cicero, if we fail to understand his outlook towards the religion of conquered nations. Pompey, the famous Roman general, had in the year 63 B.C.E, when Cicero was consul in Rome, conquered Jerusalem, thereby making the Jews of Palestine Roman subjects and taxpayers. But, not contented by the capture of the city and its population, he entered, to the great grief of the Jews, the Holy of Holies of the Temple. This has been attributed by some modern scholars to Pompey's curiosity or interest; but the explanation underrates the pride of a Roman general. Pompey's only purpose was to conquer the God of the Jews. Livy (*Periocha*, 102) clearly states, "Cnæus Pompeius conquered the Jews and took their temple Hierosolyma, which had been up to that time inviolate." And Tacitus (*Historiæ*, V, 9) adds, "Pompeius was the first of the Romans to subdue the Jews, and he entered their temple *jure victoriæ*, by right of conquest. . . ." The walls of Jerusalem were pulled down, but the sanctuary remained. Obviously Tacitus thought that Pompey, by the same right, ought to have destroyed the Temple. Pompey was greatly disappointed in finding no image in the Jewish sanctuary, which he could have taken to Rome to carry in the triumphal procession celebrating his victory over Judæa and the Jews; for the Romans, just as the ancient Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, and Syrians brought the images of conquered nations home as a visible proof of the complete conquest of the nation and its protecting gods. Cicero, as a Roman chauvinist, consistently with this Roman idea of conquest, held that all the sacred treasures of the Temple of Jerusalem became the property of the Romans, and that Pompey had the right to take possession of them; and further, that the Jews, whether living in Asia Minor or elsewhere, had no right to continue their religious practices unless they were in perfect agreement with the Roman laws.

In the year 70 Titus, the son of the Emperor Vespasian, conquered Jerusalem and its Temple. He, too, entered the Holy of Holies with his officers (Josephus, *Wars*, VI, 4, 7); he, too, found no image to take with him to Rome for his triumph, and had to be content with the holy vessels of the Temple for the purpose of representing the defeat of the Jewish god. Rabbi Nehemia, a Palestinian teacher of the second century, who seems to have understood the Roman attitude towards such victories, gave the following picture of Titus conquering the Temple (Sifrê, *Deut.* 328, *Gittin*, 58*b*), "Titus entered the Holy of Holies, cut its veil with his sword and exclaimed: 'If he is a god, let him hinder me.' When blood came out from the veil, Titus thought that he had killed the Jewish god. Then he put the vessels of the Temple in the veil, and carried them on his ship to celebrate his triumph in Rome."

The full description of Titus' triumphal procession, which Josephus gave as an eye-witness (*Wars*, VII, 5, 5, 6), confirms this interpretation of the Roman idea of the victory over Judæa and its God. Two prominent groups moved in the long and splendid procession; the first consisted of seven hundred Jewish captives selected from the many thousand leaders of the Jewish rebellion against the Romans, among them Simeon bar Giora, the head of the zealots. This group was arranged in order to impress the people of Rome with the idea of the complete dissolution and annihilation of the Jewish nation. The second group consisted of the booty, especially of the furniture of the Temple in Jerusalem, the golden table, the golden candlestick, the veil of the Holy of Holies, and a Scroll of the Torah. These costly things attracted great attention, and were meant to represent the great victory of Titus and his legions over the national god of the Jews and his sanctuary. And the arch of Titus, which was erected by the Roman senate in his honour, and is still standing, points to the same lesson by its representation of the victory over Judæa in the same two groups. One presents the cities and the greatest river of the conquered Jewish country; the other shows the spoils from the Temple of Jerusalem, the candlestick of seven branches, and the golden table with two trumpets. The inclusion of the trumpets clearly characterises the intention of the Romans to exhibit the striking features of the Jewish worship and the conquest of the most sacred furniture of the sanctuary.

All these details have been quoted here in order to elucidate the Roman idea of the legal position of the Jewish religion: the Romans believed that Judaism was as thoroughly subdued as Judæa. Hence a Roman writer of the highest culture could not understand why the Jews themselves did not abandon the worship of their god who had suffered them to be conquered. The Romans felt offended by the persistence of the Jews in continuing their national religion, and that is, as Dr. Joël (*Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, II, 103) pointed out, the main reason why Cicero, and other authors, abused the Jews as a nation born for slavery, and reviled the religion of the Jews as a strange superstition. Although history soon proved the religion of ancient Greece and Rome to be a gross superstition doomed to death, and the ideas derided by Greek and Roman writers to be eternal truths destined to civilise humanity, we can hardly be surprised at the narrow-mindedness of those Roman authors; for the same method of dealing with Jews and Judaism has been applied by modern Christian scholars and theologians. They, again, represent Christianity, the conqueror of the world, as the absolute religion, and very often protest against the impertinence of Judaism in continuing its existence and upholding its belief in the Jewish god on Christian soil. They, too, abuse the Judaism of the past in every shape and form, and they, too, claim that they are giving a fair representation of Jews and Judaism. This is undoubtedly the main reason (whether conscious or unconscious) why, in their rather dark picture of the Jews of nineteen hundred years ago, the foolish remarks and criticisms of the Roman authors are not passed by, but even quoted and used with satisfaction. Modern Christian writers like to forget that the truthfulness of those Roman writers is best gauged by the fact that they advanced against early Christianity the most horrible accusations of shedding the blood of children for religious purposes and of the most loathsome incest. Why rely on utterances of Roman writers against Jews and Judaism ? Is not, as our rabbis say, hatred as blinding to the mind as love ?

Where Greek and Roman authors give their opinions on Jewish religious belief, which is not subject to observation, they must be used with the greatest care and caution. Only when they report Jewish observances which often forced themselves upon the attention of the non-Jews, their references must be considered as worthy of attention. Their comments and historical explanations of Jewish rites and customs are notoriously foolish. No religious observance of the Jews puzzled the Roman writers more than the Sabbath, and none gave them more occasion for more ignorant, childish, malignant interpretations and comments. It is, therefore, most instructive to follow up their remarks on this feature of our religion.

3. Seneca, the Stoic philosopher, writing between 50 and 65 of the current era, considered the observance of the Sabbath a harmful practice ; the complete rest on every seventh day involves the loss of a seventh part of life, and the Jewish abstention from affairs caused difficulties. The satirist Juvenal, about the year 100, saw only laziness in the observance. Tacitus, the famous historian who wrote between 115 and 117, copied the statement of the Alexandrian anti-Semite Apion, that the Sabbath was instituted by Moses, because that day put an end to the suffering of the Israelites in the wilderness ; having learnt to like their idleness on the seventh day, they added to it, for the same reason, the repose of the seventh year. I refrain from

commenting on the childish explanations of the origin of the Sabbath suggested or copied by Tacitus. What he would not have dared to suggest about beliefs of the smallest and remotest tribe of the Gauls or the Germans, he wrote without hesitation, in his epigrammatic style, about the religion of the Jews. But we learn at least from his references that the Jews whom he knew in Rome rested completely from all their worldly affairs on the Sabbath, whether they were labourers or farmers, artisans or pedlars. They refrained from every kind of work in the way which Philo, the Jewish preacher and philosopher of Alexandria, described about the middle of the first century (*Life of Moses*, II, 137): This day of rest (he says) is a benefit, not only to animals, which by nature have been destined for man's service, but a benefit also to plants, since on the Sabbath neither a branch nor a leaf must be broken off, nor any fruit plucked. The statement in the Gospels that the Pharisees protested against Jesus' disciples for plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath proves that the custom prevailed also in Palestine. The Roman Jews acted in accordance with the general prohibition.

Even greater was the surprise of Greeks and Romans at the observance of the Sabbath when they found out that the Jews did not fight on that day. Agatharchides, a Greek historian of the second century B.C.E., jeered at the Jews of Jerusalem who were accustomed to rest completely on the seventh day, to carry no arms, to cultivate no fields, and to do no other work on that day. He reports that once Ptolemy Lagi (King of Egypt, 320 B.C.E.) attacked Jerusalem. The inhabitants, instead of guarding the city, indulged in their foolish practices, so that their country had to surrender to a hard master (Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, I, 22; *Antiquit.* XII, 1, 1). Plutarch, the well-known Greek historian and moralist (46–120 A.D.) probably refers to the same event (*De Superstitione*, 8) when he says the Jews once sat on a Sabbath in rough garments, and did not rise when the enemy set up ladders and mounted the walls, but remained wrapped in their superstition as in a net. This strict observance of the Sabbath in war was still prevalent at the beginning of the Maccabean wars. When, in the year 167 B.C.E., several hundred Jews fled from Jerusalem on account of the religious persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, and hid themselves in a cave and were attacked on the Sabbath, they would not fight to defend their lives, and preferred to perish rather than desecrate the holy day by fighting (I *Maccab.* 2, 27–38; II *Maccab.* 6, 11). This heroic attitude of the Chasidim, it is true, was not approved by Mattathias, the old Hasmonean leader. He agreed with his comrades to fight even on the Sabbath when attacked. But his more lenient and practical decision, arrived at during religious persecution, was considered by some subsequent leaders exceptional.

We find a few years later that a son of Mattathias, Jonathan the Maccabee, had to persuade his followers to fight on the Sabbath against the Syrian general Bacchides (I *Maccab.* 9, 44). It is true that in his report of Pompey's siege of Jerusalem, in the year 63 B.C.E., Josephus says (*Antiquit.* XIV, 4, 2; *Wars*, I, 7, 3): The law allows us to defend ourselves on the Sabbath against attack and surprise, but not to prevent any other undertaking of the enemy. When the Romans noticed this, they hurled no stones at the Jews on the days which we call Sabbaths, nor did they attack them, but erected ramparts and towers and brought their machines nearer, in order to work them next day. In fact, Jerusalem was conquered by Pompey on a Sabbath (*Dio Cassius*, 37, 16). Strange to say, no other reference of Josephus, or of any other writer of the history of the Jews, confirms the distinction between defence and attack on the Sabbath. In his Biography (§ 32) Josephus reports that when he was the general of Galilee in the rebellion against the Romans in the year 67, he once sent his troops away on a Friday for the Sabbath. On that occasion the people of Tiberias revolted against him, and he was in great straits. Even if my troops, he remarks, would have come back next day, they could not have taken up arms, since our laws prohibit us to do so, though necessity seems to require it. And describing the negotiations of peace between Titus and John of Gischala, the leader of the Galilean zealots, before the fall of Gischala, he reports (*Wars*, IV, 2, 3), that John said to Titus: "I must rest on this day, the Sabbath, according to the law of the Jews, as we are not permitted to negotiate about peace any more than to take up arms." Some historians understand both statements of Josephus of attack only; but the plain words hardly bear that interpretation. Another interesting episode of the history of the Jews in Babylonia, confirms the suggestion that the distinction between defence and attack on the Sabbath was not known there. About the year 35 two Jews in the important Babylonian city of Nahardea began a rebellion against the ruler of their country. The Governor of Babylonia marched against them on the Sabbath, assuming that the Jewish rebels would not fight on that day, but surrender without resistance. When surrounded by the enemy the Jews exclaimed: "We must surrender and be slaughtered like cattle, nor can we defend ourselves, for the commandment of our law compels us to rest." But their leader, Asinai, determined to transgress the law on account of the danger (*Antiquit.* XVIII, 9, 2, 6). The Jews of Nahardea thus either were ignorant of the permission to defend their lives on the Sabbath, when attacked, or they had not adopted it; or the indulgence only lasted while the Syrian persecutions were in force.

We know that Jerusalem was conquered on the Sabbath in the year 38–37 B.C.E., by King Herod and a Roman general (*Dio Cassius*, 49, 22, 6), and in the year 70 by Titus (*Dio Cassius*, 66, 7). The same day saw the fall of the Galilean city Asochis, which was conquered by Ptolemy Lathyros about the year 100

B.C.E. (Josephus, *Antiquit.* XIII, 12, 4). If the repeated fall of Jerusalem on a Sabbath was not accidental, the abstention on that day even from defensive warfare accounts for it. In the year 66 Agrippa II tried to dissuade the Jews of Jerusalem from taking up arms against the Romans (Josephus, *Wars*, II, 16, 4), and said, in the course of his long speech: "You will easily be defeated, just as your ancestors were overpowered by Pompey, on account of the Sabbath." If he were referring to attack as distinct from defence, he was not precise enough in his words. Josephus may have had the distinction in mind when he states (*Wars*, II, 192) that when Cestius, a Roman general, approached Jerusalem in the year 66 to quell the revolution in its beginning, the Jews of the city paid no respect to the seventh day and attacked the Romans, though otherwise they hallowed the Sabbath most strictly. Geiger (*Urschrift*, 225) suggested that the Sadducees differed from the Pharisees on the religious question concerning warfare on the Sabbath. The Sadducees, in their practical and political activity for the independence of Judæa, resisted at all times the intrusion of extreme religious strictness into the affairs of the State; and considered defensive warfare on the Sabbath as legitimate, perhaps, in some cases, even attack. The Pharisees, on the other hand, made the strict observance of the Torah their guide in all affairs of the individual as well as of the country, and prohibited even defence on the Sabbath. Modern Jewish and non-Jewish scholars, however, attribute the extreme strictness only to the Chasidim among the Pharisees, and this attitude towards the Sabbath is found in the so-called *Assumptio Mosis* of the beginning of the first century.

It would seem that at a later time some religious authority tried to adjust the strict prohibition of warfare on the Sabbath to the needs of the time, and to allow fighting on the seventh day. The so-called

Book of Jubilees forbids among several other things on the Sabbath fasting and fighting (50, 12). Neither the author nor the time or the country of the composition of the strange book has so far been ascertained, and therefore it is difficult to suggest against whose laxity the *Book of Jubilees* takes up its stand. But an incidental reference preserved in the Talmudic literature suggests the school opposed by the unknown author. Shammai, it is reported, permitted the continuation of the siege of a city on the Sabbath, provided it was begun three or more days before (*Sabb.* 19*a*; *Jer.* I, 8, 4*b*; *Tos. Erub.* III, 7; Sifrê, *Deut.*, 20^3). Since Shammai allowed this, he, no doubt, would have permitted defence by the inhabitants of a beleaguered Jewish city and even attack. It is a question whether his opinion was ever adopted in practice and was not merely academical, since the Jews of Jerusalem and of Galilee, about sixty years after Shammai, considered attack anyhow on the Sabbath as prohibited. And it may be mentioned here that, according to some sources, Jews in Arabia in pre-Mohammedan times, who lived as free tribes and fought vigorously for their independence, did not fight on the Sabbath (Weil, *Muhammed,* 93, 164). Since they had probably immigrated into Arabia from Palestine several centuries before Muhammed, and kept up their relations with the Palestinian religious authorities, their observance may be regarded as based on the interpretation of the law adopted in Judæa. In any case, all the passages referred to tend to prove that Agatharchides and Plutarch were correct in their reports that the Jews of Jerusalem, when attacked on a Sabbath, would not defend themselves.

Although the Greek authors do not indicate why the Jews refused to fight on the Sabbath, the Roman writers might have known the reasons from Roman official documents, if they had taken the trouble to examine the archives on the Capitol. In the year 49 B.C.E. Lentulus, a Roman consul, when drawing soldiers for Pompey's party, granted the Jews of Asia Minor, on religious grounds, the exemption from military service to which they were liable as Roman citizens (*Antiquit.*, XIV, 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19). The grounds were explained shortly afterwards by another Roman general of the party of Cæsar, in his edict to the community of Ephesus (*Antiquit.*, XIV, 10, 12): The Jews, he said, could not carry arms on the Sabbath, nor march, nor obtain food, in accordance with their laws and customs. So, too, Nicolaus of Damascus, Herod's secretary, reports that Antiochus VII had to rest for two days on his march against the Parthians, at the request of John Hyrcanos, who with his army accompanied him on this expedition, because it was a traditional festival, whereon the law of the Jews did not allow them to travel. Josephus adds: "Nor is it lawful for us to journey either on the Sabbath day, nor on a festival day." In the year 44 B.C.E. Cæsar granted the same exemption from military service in the Roman army to the Jews of Palestine (XIV, 10, 6). And when the Emperor Tiberius expelled the Jews from Rome, in the year 19, owing to a fraud of four Jews, and four thousand youths fit to carry arms were sent to Sardinia to fight against pirates, most of them refused to do military service on account of the Jewish law, and preferred to suffer heavy punishment (*Antiquit.*, XVIII, 3, 5). The Jewish Sabbath was, therefore, felt in the Roman provinces and armies in Palestine, in Asia Minor, and in Sardinia. The reports from which Tacitus (*Annales*, II, 85) and Suetonius (*Tiberius*, 36) derived their accounts of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome and the Jewish soldiers in Sardinia, must have contained a reference to the devotion to the Sabbath which Josephus found in his source. But the pagans had no room in their histories for Jewish heroism.

A. BÜCHLER.

(*To be concluded.*)

A Letter from Heine

When in Vienna last year, I was delighted to acquire the letter which is here published in the original German and with an English translation. The light it sheds on Heine's Conversion and his relation to the German Socialist, Ferdinand Lassalle, the hero of Meredith's *Tragic Comedians*, makes it of capital importance.

It is something of a disappointment to find that the letter is not quite unknown. It appears to have been published in the twenty-second volume of Elster's edition of Heine's *Gesamte Werke* (Complete Werks). It is also referred to in Kohut's *Ferd. Lassalle. Leben u. Wirken*, where the author describes the letter as remarkable (" *merkwürdig* "). The letter is addressed to Heymann Lassalle, a silk merchant of Breslau, the father of Ferdinand and Friederike, who are referred to. Friederike was the wife of Ritter von Friedland, who managed Heine's financial affairs.

Ferdinand Lassalle, when a young man of twenty, paid a visit to Paris, where he made Heine's acquaintance. The poet formed the highest opinion of Lassalle's talent and energy, and gave him a characteristic letter of introduction to Varnhagen von Ense, the subject of Carlyle's essay. He says that " Herr Lassalle is emphatically a man of the modern epoch, which will know nothing about the self-sacrifice and modesty with which we in our time more or less hypocritically drivelled and skulked." Lassalle intervened in Heine's attacks against the composer Mendelssohn, of whom the poet wrote " I bear him a grudge for his Christianising."

With regard to Heine's religious opinions, even his Christian biographers regard his baptism, in 1825, as one of the most unfortunate steps of his life and at best a " venial offence." He always retained a " secret admiration for the persecuted race from whom he was sprung." In 1844 he was struck down by spinal paralysis, under which he lingered for twelve years. In his will of 1848 he says, "though baptised, I have never sympathised with the beliefs of any religion," and in his *Reisebilder* he tells a young English girl, "I have all religions." But, early in the following year, he seems to have abandoned Hegelianism and St. Simonism, and as Henri Lichtenberger, in his *Henri Heine, Penseur*, says, "opte pour le Déisme." On January 17th, 1849, he writes about his conversion to François Mignet. In his "Rectification," sent to the German papers, he says, "I am no longer the freest German since Goethe. I am now only a poor Jew sick unto death."

In the same year he tells Alfred Meissner, "I believe anew in the personal God."

Other letters dealing with this conversion are to Max Heine, on May 3rd, 1849; to Campe, his publisher, on June 1st, 1850; and to Laube on October 12th, 1850. But the letter here published seems to be the most definite and important of the series.

ELKAN ADLER.

Paris, den 30 *April*, 1850.

Liebster Herr Lassalle,

Erst gestern bekam ich die Ausfertigung der Vollmacht, die ich hier beifüge. Ich habe sie ganz in blanco gelassen, so dass Sie selbst darin entweder Ihren eigenen Namen oder den Namen dessen, den Sie bei eigener Verantwortlichkeit mit dieser Sache betrauen wollen, hineinsetzen können. In solcher Weise haben Sie ganz freie Hand und ich zweifle nicht, dass Sie meine Interessen mit der gehörigen Vorsicht, besonders in Bezug auf eine gewisse, uns gemeinschaftlich befreundete Person vertreten werden. Im übrigen bezieh' ich

mich auf Alles, was ich in meinem vorigen Briefe gesagt habe, und ich hoffe, dass Sie die besten Maassregeln ergreifen, damit Friedland mich nicht wieder täuscht, und um einen eignen momentanen Zweck für sich zu fördern, die Prokuration die ich Ihnen gebe, benütze. Ich sowohl als meine Freunde, die meiner schrecklichen Lage wegen dem Ausgang dieser Sache mit Ungeduld entgegensehen und sowohl Ihrer Klugheit als auch Ihrer Rechtlichkeit ganz vertrauen, können Sie nicht eifrig genug bitten, mir bald Nachricht zu erteilen. Ich bitte Sie auch, wie ich bereits in meinem vorigen Briefe gethan, mir wissen zu lassen, ob ich Ihnen nach Breslau oder einem sicheren Banquier in Prag meine Actien in Natura zuschieben soll, um dort deponiert zu bleiben für unvorhergesehene Fälle. Am liebsten wäre es mir, wenn ich, wie ich schon in meinem vorigen Briefe ausgesprochen, mich dieser Actien mit einem grossen Verlust schon jetzt gleich entäussern könnte; ich brauche nicht gleich alles des Beitrages in baarem Gelde zu empfangen und würde mich zufrieden stellen, wenn ich einen Teil in Papieren bekäme, die nur in bestimmten Terminen ganz sichere oder hinlänglich garantierte Auszahlungen zusichern. Mag Friedland seinen Scharfsinn aufbieten, mir zu einer solchen Liquidation zu verhelfen, und er findet vielleicht reiche und dennoch edelgesinnte Leute, die um einen unglücklichen Dichter aus der Noth zu retten, seine Bestrebungen in dieser Beziehung unterstützen. Diessmal gilt es, dass er seine Pfiffigkeit anstrenge ehe ich die Augen schliesse und alle Reue zu spät kommt. Meine Krankheit nimmt schrecklich zu von Tag zu Tag und es wäre mir weit heilsamer, über weniger betrübsame Themata zu correspondieren.—Ihrer Frau Tochter bitte ich meine herzlichsten Grüsse zukommen zu lassen; es vergeht keine meiner schlaflosen Nächte, wo nicht ihr trotziges Gesichtchen mir ins Gedächtnis kommt. Welche weisse Haut, und welches gute Herz!—Von Ihrem Sohne habe ich keine

Nachricht und bin sehr begierig etwas über ihn zu erfahren. Ich möchte sein Gesicht sehen, wenn ihm zu Ohren kommt, dass ich aller atheistischen Philosophie satt, wieder zu dem demütigen Gottesglauben des gemeinen Mannes zurückgekehrt bin. Es ist in der That wahr, was das Gerücht, obgleich mit Übertreibung von mir verbreitet hat. Hat Ferdinand noch etwas innere Geistesruhe, so dürfte auch bei ihm diese Nachricht ein heilsames Nachdenken hervorbringen.—Und nun leben Sie wohl, melden Sie mir bald eine erfreuliche Nachricht und genehmigen Sie die Versicherung meiner ausgezeichneten Hochachtung.

Heinrich Heine.

50 *Rue d'Amsterdam.*

TRANSLATION

Paris, 30*th April*, 1850.

Dearest Herr Lassalle,

Only yesterday did I receive the engrossment of the Power of Attorney, which I enclose herewith. I have left it entirely in blank, so that you yourself can insert either your own name or the name of the person whom, at your own responsibility, you will entrust with this matter. You have an entirely free hand, and I do not doubt that you will represent my interests with the necessary care, especially having regard to a certain person who is a common friend of ours. For the rest I refer to all that I have said in my previous letter; and I hope that you will see to it that Friedland does not deceive me again, and use the procuration which I give you in order to advance a momentary purpose of his own. I, as well as my friends, who in consequence of my terrible condition look forward to the conclusion of this matter with impatience, and have

complete confidence in your wisdom, as well as your sense of justice, cannot too earnestly beg you to give me news soon. I also beg you, as I did in my previous letter, to let me know whether I am to send my shares *in natura* to you in Breslau, or to a safe banker in Prague, so that they may remain deposited there for emergencies. I should prefer, as I have already told you in my previous letter, to get rid of these shares immediately at a great loss; but I do not insist on receiving the whole sum at once in cash, and would be satisfied if I got a portion in securities, which would assure at fixed dates certain or sufficiently guaranteed payments. Let Friedland try to use his sharpness to help me to such a liquidation, and perhaps he will find rich and yet honourably minded people who would assist his endeavours in this respect in order to save an unhappy poet from want. This time it is necessary that he should exert his skill before I close my eyes and all repentance comes too late. My illness increases terribly from day to day, and it would be much healthier to correspond about less annoying themes.

I beg you to give my heartiest greetings to your daughter; none of my sleepless nights pass without her impudent little face coming to my memory. What a white skin, and what a good heart!—From your son I have no news, and I am very curious to learn something about him. I should like to see his face when it comes to his ears that, sick of all atheistic philosophy, I have come back to the common man's humble belief in God. What rumour has spread about me is really true, though exaggerated. If Ferdinand still has any inner tranquillity of spirit, then this report might induce a healthy thoughtfulness in him. And now farewell. Send me soon good news, and accept the assurance of my distinguished esteem.

HEINRICH HEINE.

50 *Rue d'Amsterdam.*

The Pogroms *

THE study of the pogroms prepared by the London Relief Commission has at length appeared in two portly volumes, a volume of general discussion and a volume of detailed description. The fruit of much inquiry and many laboured investigations is packed in their pages, but the work is most certainly not final. It is weak in form and weak in substance. There are chapters of which every word is a spasm and every sentence a convulsion; and where the style flows more equably, too often it meanders without force or colour or definite direction. The analysis is redundant and incomplete. Many things are related at excessive length and with unnecessary repetition; many questions which should have been asked are not raised, still less answered. These two volumes, however, if in no sense the book on the pogrom, are a preparation for it. They are a quarry of materials out of which a philosophic student may one day shape an illuminating image of a tragedy.

What is a pogrom? Better than any abstract definition is a concrete record taken haphazard of an actual pogrom. Orscha is a town of 14,000 inhabitants, half of them Jews. On October 18th, 1905, the news of the proclamation of the Constitution reached Orscha. On the 19th the general strike stopped; Jew and Christian embraced; the houses were hung with flags, a service of thanksgiving was held; processions filled the streets. In the evening the Mohilew police officer Misgaib entered the town, and the rumour ran round that a patriotic demonstration was to take place and the Jews to be beaten. On the 20th drunken men gathered to take the

---

* *Die Judenpogrome in Russland.* Köln und Leipzig, Jüdischer Verlag.

official's orders. On the morning of the 21st the peasants entered the town armed with axes and guns. "The village authorities have sent us; whoever does not come will be punished. We are to do whatever is ordered." At one o'clock a priest exhorted the crowds of the faithful to purge their city of the aliens, and the cry arose, "Long live absolutism! Down with the mayor, who has sold the town to the Jews." The first murders followed. The house of a rich Jew was stormed. Without the soldiers fired, a priest held service, and a band played the national anthem; while within eight men, women, and children were tortured to death. The appetite was only whetted. At six o'clock the peasants begged the police for more orders, more work. They were told to wait till daylight; the darkness might encourage the Jews to resist. On the same day twelve Jewish youths came from Schklow to help their brethren. They were met at the station and murdered, and for seven hours every man that passed mutilated or insulted their dead bodies. Twenty-three members of the Self-Defence Organisation came by boat from Dubrowna; peasants, police, and soldiers killed ten; and massacre became general. The 23rd was given up to plunder. At midday the vice-governor spoke to the crowds. "Children, it is enough. You have had three days' amusement, now go home and sing 'God save the Czar.'" They remained, and on the 24th seven more of the Dubrowna lads were killed. The pogrom ended just a week after Russia's freedom had been proclaimed.

The pogrom at Orscha was typical of what took place that October. The month witnessed, of greater and lesser pogroms, 690. The dead were nearly 900, the wounded many hundreds more, and some of the worst pogroms, Bialystok and Sedlitz, were to come later. The fury swept down on 200,000 Jews and destroyed six millions of property, and where the destruction itself did not come the shadow of it and the dread blasted.

What that October meant in anguish of soul no man can estimate. The gates of hell opened for five million souls—in that form Russia's freedom came to the Russian Jew.

A distinction must be drawn between Russia and Poland. It was the boast of the Poles that a pogrom was impossible in Poland. There was anti-Semitism in plenty in Poland, but the Poles are more civilised than the Russians, and they are a conquered people. They were in great hope of assimilating the Jews, and in great fear of driving them into the arms of the Russians. But the pogroms came. There was one at Warsaw, in 1881 ; at Lodz, in 1892 ; and the Russian October had its echo at Sedlitz ; but Sedlitz was the work of Russian soldiers, and on the whole Poland was free from the pogrom spirit, and certainly free from its most murderous manifestations. The pogrom is Russian, and its stronghold is the southern provinces, of which Odessa is the fitting capital.

The pogroms of October, 1905, were not the last or the first. In 1881 the first series came after centuries. The outburst was neither so extensive nor so destructive as that of a quarter of a century later, and the attitude of the Government and the people was different. In 1881 the pogroms came with the consent and encouragement of the local authorities, but the central Government was against them. Alexander III hated the Jews, but he had a sense of decency. He denounced the pogroms ; he ordered their suppression ; he punished the guilty. In 1905 the central Government was as guilty as its subordinates in the provinces. The inspiration and the orders came from the capital ; the pogrom became the road to Imperial favour. The makers of pogroms were promoted, the murderers were pardoned, the organisation which arranged them could count the Emperor as a patron. In 1881 the pogrom was a thing to be ashamed of, for the priest to oppose, and the man of culture to denounce. In 1905 it was an instrument of State policy, the vigorous expression of a political doctrine. In 1881 the revolutionary could fancy the pogrom movement a manifestation of progressive Russian democracy, of an awakening which would, after trifling with the Jews, burst upon the Government. In 1905 the pogrom was reactionary beyond all illusion. Roughly the pogrom of 1881 was economic and religious anti-Semitism, the pogrom of 1905 political anti-Semitism.

In 1881 the Jew is denounced as an exploiter, and that is the text of the long series of repressive laws which follows upon the pogrom. In 1905 the pretence is neither possible nor needed. The Jew has been banished from the villages; industry has taken the large form in which the Jew's part is visibly insignificant, and the poverty of the Jew cries to Heaven. But the Jew has become a conscious proletarian, has entered the revolutionary movement, has become a political portent. The Nihilist movement of the 'seventies, which culminated in the murder of Alexander II, is very different from the political movement which culminated in the Constitution of 1905. It is the work of a handful, and it has no real contact with the mass of Russians of any class. An individual Jew, a Jew who has left his people, may be found in the movement, but the mass of Jews dwell apart untouched. They are within their Ghettos and hold firm by their ancient faith and their traditional resignation. Their separateness is a thing dear to them. In 1905 all this has changed. The storm of 1881 swept the Jews by the hundred thousand across the seas; the grinding persecution of the State scattered the intellectual youth of Jewry to every centre of agitation. The sense of security and permanence and seclusion was violently destroyed, and the economic evolution of the cities of the Pale completed the transformation. The Jews were caught up in the revolutionary movement. The part played by Jews in the revolutionary movement has been exaggerated. It has been exaggerated by themselves; it has been exaggerated by their enemies. For years before 1905 the Russian officials, in their reports, deliberately confound Jew and agitation. We can see why they should. With the breaking of the Ghetto gates the Jew had suddenly revealed himself as the quickest element in Russia to absorb culture, and culture and Russian autocracy are enemies. Instinctively, therefore, the reactionary official finds the Jew in process of acquiring the Western learning politically suspect; and it is good tactics to identify the Liberal agitation with the hated Jew. Yet, even when all allowance is made, it seems clear that the Jews have played an exceptional part in the war of Russian liberation. They have given more than their due proportion of rank and file, and more than their quota of skilful and devoted leaders. The pogroms of 1905 bear this stamped upon their face. They are inspired by the Government, rewarded by the Czar, and condoned by Society because the Liberal movement has changed from sporadic outrage into a comprehensive agitation, and the Jews symbolise that change. In 1905 to strike at the Jew is to strike at Liberty; the pogrom is the self-defence of autocracy.

Between 1881 and 1905 there are other differences even more important—how it struck the world outside Russia and how it struck the Jew. Measured by suffering, by blood, by intensity, the pogroms of 1905 were twice or three times as great as the pogroms of 1881; they came, too, immediately after the declaration of Russian freedom, and they burst into a world that had laid another quarter of a century of enlightenment and civilisation behind it. It might have been expected that the impression upon the world would have been correspondingly deeper and the indignation more burning. The contrary happened. The pogroms of 1881 shocked the world; in 1905 the world was sympathetic, but it did not blaze, and the emotion passed almost before the blood was dry. Many explanations might be suggested. The pessimists might say that the generality of Gentiles have lost, if they ever possessed, the quality of feeling the agony of the Jew; that anti-Semitism had passed with the Jew from Russia and become a universal mode. The political philosopher might say that a generation of Bismarckian Imperialism has blunted quick and generous instincts, and sapped the sympathy with small peoples. And there is yet another explanation. The pogroms of 1881 were a storm by themselves; the pogroms of 1905 were a gust in a larger storm. They were an episode in the struggle for Russian liberty, and against that background of travail the martyrdom of five millions hardly showed. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that the Gentile world felt lightly and forgot easily. Unfortunately, we must say that the Jewish world outside Russia reacted not so differently from its Gentile neighbours. We were sympathetic and we raised notable sums of money, but did the horror come home to us as the slaughter of our brothers, as a tragedy to our people, and to us as part of that people, and does it abide with us, a memory that can never fade and never cease to teach? It is difficult to escape the influence of an atmosphere in which we live, and some at least of the factors which tempered the Gentile may have tempered us; and as Jews we have lost our emancipation optimism. The pogrom of 1881 smashed a tradition and an illusion, the soft illusion that the golden age of humanity was come in which Jew and Gentile might lie down together and persecution cease even to be understood. A generation of anti-Semitism followed from which no country escaped. Persecution became common form, and the pogroms of 1905 were the culmination of a wave. They destroyed no pleasing faith; they rather confirmed a bitter anticipation. There was a naturalness, an inevitability about them, which took from horror its sharpest edge. Yet if the heart was already too sick to feel the utmost fullness of pain, we might have thought, dissected our souls, analysed our agony. Have we done even that?

What the pogroms meant to the world is something, what they meant to Jewry outside Russia is more, but what they meant to the Jews inside Russia is most. Here, too, the comparison between 1881 and 1905 is pitiful, if instructive. The pogroms of 1881 were an attack on the Russian Jew because of his separateness; the pogroms of 1905 were an attack on the Russian Jew because of his assimilation. The individuality of the Jew drew down the storm in the one case; the association of the Jew with the general Russian political movement drew down the storm in the other case. The difference goes to the root of things; it is the spring of unnumbered consequences of first importance. The pogroms of 1881 were the fathers of Chibbas Zion and the grandfather of Zionism; they mark an epoch in Jewish nationalism. They sent men like Lilienblum and Pinsker back to their people and back to the land of our fathers; they produced that intensely national Hebrew literature of which Achad Haam is the star; they sowed Palestine with colonies and Russia with schools. The enemies of the Jews had made Judaism the point of their attack, and the Jews rallied to Judaism. The pogrom was seen to raise the question not only of the Jews, but of Judaism; and it was understood that emigration to America might answer the one; but only Palestine could answer the other. Even outside Russia, though less consciously, the same feeling was active. Baron de Rothschild's colonies are the fruit of the pogroms of 1881; the Ito is the fruit of the pogroms of 1905.

No nationalist revival, no deepening of Jewish consciousness followed the pogroms of 1905. They were the symbol of assimilation. When the political movement seized the Pale it came to destroy. It carried away the law and the prophets, the Cheder and the Yeshiba. The culture of centuries became a thing to be despised, the traditions of centuries the butt of a mocking wit. The twentieth century brought in the Jewish Nihilist, and the civilisation of the Ghetto fell at a blow. Judaism was flung into the dreadful brew which was to give Russia youth, and when the great venture failed, the reckless experimenters found themselves disillusioned and bereft. The pogroms of 1905 were Russia's reward to Russian Jewry for its sacrifices for Russian freedom.

Standing apart one may see the tragedy and the moral; but it is difficult to know whether they are equally clear to those who are in the heat and the dust. Will the pogroms teach the youth of Russian Jewry that theirs was not the way and that Judaism is too heavy a price to pay for emancipation? The Russian war of liberation is the only one in which Jewish blood has been poured out like water, and the new gods may become more sacred than the old. The war, too, is not yet over, and at any moment the call may come again and the battle sweep up our best energies in an alien cause. After such a shock we cannot expect new national life and vigour. It is something to find that we have come through alive and not wholly shattered. The period of truce is a time for reassembling our energies, for recovering the stragglers, and for restoring the broken contact with the past. Happily there are in Russia more than 7000 who have not bowed the knee to Baal, enough to carry the ark of Judaism through the troublous times. H. SACHER.

Pragmatism and Religion

New tendencies in philosophy have a way of exciting interest outside the strictly philosophical coteries. This is natural, for philosophical theories generally have some direct or indirect bearing on the problems of religion; and people of culture who are not contented to seek refuge in the sheer dogmatism of a *credo quia absurdum* like to feel that their religious outlook is in the direction of the philosophic tendencies of their age. Pragmatism, the latest of philosophic novelties, has attracted more than its due share of public interest, just because of its special bearing on the religious attitude. In the writings of Professor William James, Pragmatism first appeared as a defender of the faith, as the apologist of the "will to believe," against the onslaughts of scientific sceptics and agnostics. Since then, however, it has undergone considerable changes, and its ambitions have increased greatly. Religious men are naturally eager to welcome any promising ally, especially in these days of doubt; and Pragmatism has consequently been readily espoused by not a few leaders of religious thought. It seems especially helpful to the smaller religious communities by offering a justification for their continued independence as against the larger churches, which are so eager to swallow them up. No wonder, then, if some ingenious Jews discover special affinities between Pragmatism and Judaism; only one is naturally rather sceptical about such discoveries when he remembers that there is hardly an "ism" under the sun which Judaism, according to somebody or other, has not anticipated.

In this paper it is proposed to deal with Pragmatism on its own merits, and in the light of the various factors which may have helped to evolve it, and only then will its bearing on religion be briefly considered.

The essence of Pragmatism lies in its conception of Truth. "The true (according to Pragmatists) is only the expedient in the way of our thinking." "An idea is 'true' so long as to believe it is profitable to our lives."

Such a conception of truth is no doubt very convenient for purposes of religious apologetics; but, taken at its face value, it is almost sinister in its suggestion, and one is not altogether surprised to find the *Times* speaking of a "hardened and unconscionable Pragmatism," and referring to the election posters as typical of Pragmatist truth! Of course, Pragmatists will repudiate the slur. But really their language is very largely responsible for all the misunderstandings of which they are for ever complaining. Their account of truth is misleading in so far as it is novel; and when duly qualified to obviate misinterpretations it loses its novelty. But of this more anon. For the present, we must try to realise the motive underlying this view of truth. Ordinarily we think of a true idea or a true belief as that which agrees with reality. Why does the Pragmatist abandon this conception of truth?

The answer is to be sought in the critical philosophy of Kant and the positivism of Comte and their influence on the scientific men of the nineteenth century. Stated briefly, the view of truth as agreement with reality seems to imply that you can only determine whether your thought is true if you can contemplate reality apart from your thought of it, in order to see whether your thought agrees with the reality. This, of course, is an impossible feat. Kant and Comte had, accordingly, insisted that we do not and cannot know things as they are in themselves, we only know their appearances, or how they appear to us. Men of science soon took up the cry, and modern scientists are quite loud in their protestations that the sciences give us no real images or pictures of reality, and are little more than a mirage. The Laws of Nature, they say, are only conventional summaries of past experiences, they carry with them no guarantee as regards the future, but so far all calculations and expectations based on them have been found to work somehow—and that is all that is meant in calling them true. Taking its cue from this, Pragmatism maintains that a true idea or belief is one that " works," or leads us rightly to the expected goal, or to a satisfying experience. From this point of view Pragmatism appears to be the outcome of the sceptical tendencies of the nineteenth century, the philosophic expression of the growing distrust in the extent of human knowledge. Pragmatists, however, object against being classed with sceptics, and to some extent rightly so.

For, as already suggested, Professor James's Pragmatism made its début in opposition to Scepticism, and in defence of religious faith. Angered, perhaps, by the opposition with which the theory of evolution met at the hands of the leaders of religious thought in the nineteenth century (to say nothing of the Church's opposition to science in earlier centuries), scientists like Clifford and Huxley came to regard scepticism as a virtue, and belief, " when given to unproved and unquestioned statements for the solace and private pleasure of the believer," as a sinful desecration, if not " the lowest depth of immorality." From such a standpoint religious faith could only be regarded as a stolen pleasure unworthy of self-respecting men; and agnosticism appeared to be the only right attitude towards religious questions. It was by way of protest against such sceptical views that Professor James's Pragmatism made its first appearance, maintaining that we are sometimes justified in entertaining beliefs for which there is no adequate evidence, and that this kind of thing is to be met with even in science. " We all of us (he said) believe in molecules and the conservation of energy, in democracy and necessary progress . . . all for no reasons worthy of the name. . . . Our reason is quite satisfied, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of every thousand of us, if it can find a few arguments that will do to recite in case our credulity is criticised by someone else."

Now it may, I think, be maintained against agnosticism that it exaggerates the rôle of discursive reason, and that reason does not so much initiate theories as criticise and control them. One may side with Pragmatism in maintaining that it is always some human interest that prompts our speculations, and that we are often content with theories which have not been proven, provided they do not positively offend against our reason, and satisfy some interest of ours. But Pragmatism seems to err in exaggerating the claims of human interest at the expense of human reason. And if, on the one hand, it repels the demands of scepticism by vindicating the legitimacy of beliefs based on practical rather than on rational grounds, yet, on the other hand, it seems to advocate a form of extreme intellectual scepticism, when it maintains that all so-called truths are nothing but beliefs which satisfy, or are expedient, or profitable in some way or other.

As a comprehensive theory of truth Pragmatism is untenable, and derives what plausibility it has from its very wide and very vague use of such expressions as "satisfying," "expedient," etc. Taking the expression in its ordinary meaning, it is obviously untrue to say that all "satisfying" beliefs are true, or even that all true beliefs are satisfying. There are many satisfying beliefs which are not true; there are many beliefs which are decidedly *dis*satisfying just because they are true; and even as regards those beliefs which are both true and satisfying, most people discriminate between their truth and their satisfaction, finding them satisfactory because true, not true because satisfactory. Of course, if you interpret "satisfying" in the very widest and vaguest possible way, then no doubt it is true to say that whatever we believe to be true must satisfy us *that it is true.* Thus regarded the Pragmatist theory is comprehensive indeed. Whatever your theory of truth may be, whatever you may set up as constituting the nature of truth (whether agreement with reality, or consistency, or what not) you must, of course, feel satisfied that your belief has the requisite character when you hold it to be true. Thus interpreted the Pragmatist view of truth seems to bring together all other views under a common formula, which is not so much comprehensive as confounding, by appearing to stress what is merely accidental rather than what is essential to truth.

By emphasising " satisfactoriness " as the essence of truth, Pragmatism makes it almost unrecognisable. Ordinarily, for instance, it is considered that what is really true is true for everybody ; but since one belief may satisfy one person, and the opposite belief may satisfy another person, Pragmatism is forced to admit that incompatible beliefs may all of them be true at the same time, and the fundamental principles of thought are explained away as so many " postulates," or working assumptions, the disregard of which need cause no misgivings. Again, since a belief which satisfies us at one time may cease to do so at another time, truth is not only variable as from one person to another, but also mutable as from one time to another. Truth thus seems to depend on human choice (not to say caprice) more than on objective facts. And, indeed, Pragmatism loudly proclaims that Truth *is* " man-made." Such views are certainly strange, and that is where the novelty of Pragmatism comes in. On the other hand, these views must embody some elements of truth, otherwise they could never be made to appear plausible. We propose, accordingly, to distinguish the true elements from the false in the Pragmatist contention.

If we use the term " belief " in the sense in which psychologists generally use it, namely, not as meaning " *mere* belief," but as standing for all degrees of assertiveness from *mere* belief to the surest knowledge, then we may describe " truth " as a true belief. If so, there can be no truth without belief (though things, of course, may exist without being truly known). And since there can be no belief without a believer, there can be no truth without someone to believe it. To this extent, accordingly, truth may be said to depend on man or to be "man-made." But all that is implied thereby is that the *existence* of the belief depends on man, not the *truth* of it. The *truth* of the belief is independent of the believer; it depends on the things to which it refers, and the reality and character of things is generally independent of their being known, and is not affected by their becoming known. For instance, it depends on me whether I should look up at the sky or not, and to that extent, therefore, it also depends on me whether or not I think that "the sky is clouded"; but as soon as I entertain this thought or belief, the *truth* of it does *not* depend on me, but on the things called sky and clouds. Similarly, it depends on me whether or not I believe that "Mars is inhabited"; but once I do believe this to be the case, the *truth* of my belief does not in any way depend on me, but solely on the facts referred to, namely, the existence of Mars and its inhabitants, and neither Mars nor its inhabitants (if any) can in any way be affected by my belief or disbelief. In short, the independence of Reality confers independence on Truth, notwithstanding the dependence of Belief.

The Pragmatist contention that Truth is "man-made" derives its chief plausibility from those cases in which we *realise* our beliefs. These cases are cited by the Pragmatist as evidence that we can *make our beliefs true.* A careful analysis of any such instance shows, however, that when we realise a hope or wish, and thus, in a sense, make it come true, we do not *make* our belief true, we only *prove* it true—which is a different thing. Let us examine the Pragmatists' most plausible illustration. "How many women's hearts," says Professor James, "are vanquished by the mere sanguine insistence of some man that they must love him! He will not consent to the hypothesis that they cannot.

The desire for a certain kind of truth here brings about that special truth's existence; and so it is in innumerable cases of other sorts." It is barbarous to submit the poetry of love to the cold scrutiny of logic; but what must not one do in the cause of Truth! Now what are the bare facts? Jacob loves Rachel, and, believing that she reciprocates his affection, he proposes and is accepted. Now if she accepted him because she loved him, then his belief was true simply because, as a matter of fact, she did love him; she might have loved him just as much (perhaps more so) even if from sheer modesty he had never discovered the fact. The proposal and the acceptance, then, only *proved* the truth of his belief, and did not *make* it true. If, on the other hand, she did not really love him, then, whether she accepted him or not, his belief was false. But perhaps this is not the kind of case contemplated by Professor James. Let us suppose a case where the course of love did not run so smooth. Jacob believing, in his haste, that Rachel loves him, proposes and is rejected (gently, perhaps, or with some little reluctance). His belief was therefore false. But hope springs eternal in the human breast, and so he modifies his belief. He believes that Rachel will yet love him when he has shown himself more worthy of her; and eventually he wins the love of his Rachel. Here, again, his perseverance and the realisation of his hope only *proved* the truth of his belief, and did not *make* it true. Rachel might have been just as capable of loving him if he persevered, and he might have believed this to be the case; but fortune might not have favoured him to put his belief to the test, and, in that case, his belief would have been just as *true*, though not *proven*. That the *truth* of his belief depended on the nature of Rachel, and not simply on himself, would of course, have appeared even more decisively if Rachel flatly refused him till the end of the chapter. But Professor James has no sympathy with rejected suitors.

What happens in all such cases in which beliefs seem to be *made* true is this: Someone wants X to become Y, and, believing that the realisation of certain conditions can change X into Y, he sets about realising these conditions, and his wish is thereupon fulfilled. This, however, does not *make* his belief true, it only *proves* that it was true, and it would have been just as true if he had not proved it. His successful action does not *make* his belief true, it only *proves* that his belief was true. A man's action is, of course, a part of reality, and can work changes in the world. And man's actions are, it is true, directed and controlled by his beliefs. But it is not our belief that makes our wishes realisable if things are against us, and the desired end is beyond the power of the believer. In fact, the Pragmatist view might well be reversed. It is not the realisation of our wishes that makes our beliefs true, but, on the contrary, it is the truth of our beliefs that makes the realisation of our wishes possible. For unless we have true beliefs as to what can be done and how it should be done, we are condemned to a life of disappointments, of hopes unrealised.

Pragmatism deliberately identifies the *truth* of a belief with the *proof* of it. This is shown by the Pragmatist use of the expression *verification*. Usually "verification" means the *testing* of a belief, or the attempt to *prove* it; but the Pragmatist employs the expression in the sense of *making* a belief true. Now there are several kinds of proof, according to the nature of what is to be proved. For instance, I have just been told that the polyanthuses in our garden are in bloom, and I believe it. If I want to verify my belief I can go out into the garden and look. If I see them there, then I have *proved* my belief to be true, but I have not *made* it true. What makes it true is the actual blooming of the polyanthuses, and my looking at them does not make them bloom; it is only because they are actually in bloom that I can see them at all. And so with innumerable similar beliefs. It is ridiculous to say that such beliefs are true simply because they "work" or "lead rightly"; they are true because the facts are as they are believed to be. Our experience in normal perception carries with it the highest degree of certainty, and may not be questioned unless there are positive reasons for suspecting it to be abnormal. The mere vague possibility that things are absolutely different from what they appear to be in normal perception is hardly worth serious consideration. Is it not paradoxical to maintain that knowledge in some way distorts things? To know what a thing is you must, of course, know it; but because you know it you cannot know what it really is! At all events the burden of the proof lies on the shoulders of the sceptics.

Unfortunately, not all beliefs can be proved in such a simple manner. Most of the hypotheses of science, for instance, cannot be proved absolutely; they can only be confirmed more and more, in so far as they account for, or seem to represent accurately, all the relevant observations made, and even help to anticipate future observations. Scientific hypotheses or theories are mostly of the nature of solutions to inverse problems, and it is in the nature of an inverse problem that one cannot, as a rule, be absolutely sure that any one solution represents the way in which the result to be accounted for has actually come about. All one can say in such cases is that if the operative conditions were such as the theory suggests, then this result would follow; but it is just possible that some other conditions may have produced that result. Strictly speaking, therefore, many of the so-called verified or true theories of science are only beliefs that "work," or "lead rightly," rather than fully established truths. And the Pragmatist, taking these things as typical "truths," accordingly develops his conception of "truth" as a belief which "works," or is "expedient," or "satisfying." But these are not typical truths, and although they are *believed* in so far as they "work," they are *true* only in so far as the facts are what they are represented to be; in so far as they are merely "working" devices, they are just useful devices, but not "truths."

We are now in a position to consider the special relationship of Pragmatism to Religion. Religious beliefs are mostly even less capable of strict verification than are many hypotheses of science. They are commonly not regarded as *proved*, or even as capable of being proved. And that is just why it is considered to be a merit to believe them. If, then, we are to compare the different tenets of different creeds, we cannot do so by the ordinary methods of science at all. That is to say, they cannot be compared from a purely logical, intellectual, or rational standpoint. If we are to compare them at all, therefore, the comparison must be based on moral considerations. And this, after all, is the most relevant standard of comparison. My neighbour's beliefs concern me only in so far as they affect his conduct towards me and other members of the social organism; beyond this his beliefs are his business, and not mine. Thus regarded, religious beliefs which are seen to exercise a good influence on conduct must be considered good; and however much various faiths may differ from one another, so long as they appear to exercise an equally good moral influence over their votaries, they must be considered equally good. But the *goodness* of a belief is no proof of its *truth*, much less identical with it; and conflicting beliefs, though they may be equally *good*, cannot be equally *true*. Each belief is either true or false, and this depends neither on our choice, nor on its effects, but on the reality to which it refers, and which is independent of our mere beliefs.

Stressing the purely moral aspect of religious faith certainly makes for social welfare. And to this extent Pragmatism may be rendering a good service. If people could be brought to believe that their religious views, however diverse, may yet be equally true if they make them equally good, it would certainly make for tolerance; and tolerance is a fine thing. But the Pragmatist view of Truth is a mistaken one; and what good there is in Pragmatism is really separable from its errors. Judaism, for instance, has repeatedly emphasised the practical or moral side of religious beliefs, and, in a generous moment, has even appraised a *good* pagan as highly as a Jewish high priest; but it never suggested that the beliefs of the two are therefore equally *true*. Such an attitude is sound; it contains the honey of Pragmatism without its sting; and it represents the attitude of all civilised peoples. Moreover, the zealots of the dominant church of any country are hardly likely to accept the logic of Pragmatism. Clear-headed and kind-hearted people will realise the primacy of their moral duties, even without Pragmatism; they will agree to differ on matters of religious faith, recognising that bullying and bribery are not logical arguments, and that it is immoral to commit a sure wrong in the supposed interests of a possible truth, however much they may believe it. Zealous conversionists, on the other hand, are only likely to find in Pragmatism a new kind of justification of Jesuitical methods.

On most people, moreover, the effect of Pragmatism can hardly be salutary. The suggestion that different beliefs may be equally true rather conveys the idea that they are all equally untrue, or equally doubtful; and religious belief may appear to be degraded into mere make-believe. Surely it is a more inspiring conception that, although our beliefs are mutable and liable to error, yet Truth is neither mutable nor man-made, and that though we may all be marching along different roads, and falling into various pitfalls on the way, nevertheless we are all seeking and approaching the same objective Truth, the same fuller and truer knowledge of the same real world, which we can also *make* better as we get to *know* it better. A. WOLF.

A Reform of Judaism upon a Nationalist Basis

(A Sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. J. L. Magnes in Temple Emanu-El, New York)

> "And Jacob sent messengers before him to Esau his brother . . . and the messengers returned to Jacob saying, We are approaching thy brother Esau, and moreover, he cometh to meet thee, and four hundred men with him. Then Jacob was greatly afraid and was distressed; and he divided the people that was with him, and the flocks, and the herds, and the camels, into two companies."

THIS is a picture of the present situation among the Jews. We have gone forth beyond our Ghetto Walls to meet our brother Esau, and he has come to meet us with his larger army. In the process, our forces have become divided into various companies, sects, and parties. This meeting with the world without us and this dividing of our encampment have brought great distress to multitudes of our people, until the cry of Jacob has almost become our cry: Save me, O Lord, from the hand of my brother!

All about us we hear the noise of the breaking up of camp, of the dismemberment of families, of the wandering from land to land; and we hear the din of party and sectarian strife, brother becoming estranged from brother. And we wonder which will be the "company that is left and that is to escape."

The stress of economic forces leading to the disintegration of the old centres of Jewish population and to the establishment of new homes is changing the values heretofore put upon our spiritual treasures. Our standards are being shifted, and our ideals of aristocracy and of democracy are taking on the commonplace hue. Those who once were poor and ignorant become in the new surroundings powerful and of high estate; and those who once were learned and of high position now lapse into oblivion. The scattering of our people in small companies to the four corners of the earth brings with it also the breakdown of much of our old moral and religious strength.

But while the old Ghettos are crumbling, those of us native in newer lands are erecting our newer Ghettos. If, however, the walls of the old Ghettos were reared largely by virtue of an inner impulse to erect a Fence for the Law, the walls of our newer Ghettos are being erected largely by compulsion from without; and as a substitute for the light and warmth that permeated the old Ghetto, we are seeking to veneer the ugliness of our own bleak walls by thick layers of the gold which we may have acquired. We have our Jewish clubs, ranging from mere gambling clubs to clubs with libraries and an occasional lecture. But the members of these clubs come together chiefly because they are refused admission to similar institutions of their Gentile neighbours. There are also private schools, which are attended almost exclusively by Jewish children who are excluded from similar schools of their fellow-citizens. The parents would doubtless be scandalised to hear such schools called Jewish; and indeed, they are not, because they have no trace of Judaism within them, which, after all, would be the one and sufficient reason for bringing Jewish children together. Our social life, also, is made up, to a great extent, of intercourse with our own, which is, as far as I am concerned, satisfying, but which is, for very many of those with social ambitions, a bitter disappointment, and is the final proof for them of the misfortune of being Jews.

We find also, through it all, the inevitable desire for spiritual and mental nutriment. The religious need of the more sentimental seems to be satisfied by the new Jewish church, known as Christian Science. And for those of rationalistic and unemotional tendencies, membership in a semi-Ghetto such as, for example, the Ethical Culture Society, is sufficient. Much of our mental pabulum, furthermore, is of the superficial sort that comes to our women from patronising a few lectures at, let us say, the League for Political Education or in participation, for instance, in the woman's suffrage movement.

Our splendid work of benevolence finally is, to a large extent, in the hands of men and of women who are ignorant of Judaism, of their own place within it, and of the implications of Judaism for the life of our people. Their noble charitable work, for which there can be nothing but praise, is, in many of its aspects, not the result of a positive Jewish spirit, but rather the diversion of a leisure hour and the unaccountable impulse to be of help to those whose inner life they hardly understand.

This division into camps, this loosening of our fibre, of which I have just spoken, concerns, however, the circumference and the abnormal conditions of our people's life rather than its inmost being. But if we glance at our life's centre, we shall find that here, too, there is a conflict of parties, the acrimony of sectarian strife. Conflict and differentiation are not, in themselves, without merit. But to be worthy of the dignity of being called a conflict it must be upon the high ground of principle, and between men whose motives cannot be called into question.

The superficial observer will tell you that there are two parties: The Reformed and the Orthodox. The Reformed party finds the breath of its life in a denunciation of the traditions and aspirations of the Orthodox. The strict Orthodox party, on the other hand, regarding with suspicion the inroads that may be made upon Judaism if an iota of its traditions be sacrificed, is rigid in its insistence upon the complete observance of all the minutiæ of the Law.

This superficial observation, however, leaves out of account an important development in Judaism during the last two generations. This development may perhaps best be characterised by a citation from our old literature used by Nachman Krochmal at the beginning of his classic work and by Shefer in his characterisation of Zecharias Frankel: "The Torah may be compared to two paths: the one of light and the other of snow. What, then, is to be done? Choose the middle path." There is a further saying: "A man always takes the middle path and never the by-paths, for there the angels of death are lurking." In other words, a new generation has arisen in our midst, a generation that is neither Orthodox nor Reformed. It is composed of enthusiastic, thoughtful, hopeful Jews and Jewesses. This generation is not Orthodox in so far as it is not in all respects like its fathers and in so far, also, it may be termed reformed. But this generation is not Reformed, for it abhors the extremes to which Reformed Judaism has led as much as it abhors all other forms of Jewish apostasy. This generation is not Orthodox, though it may regret that it cannot be so. It is not Orthodox, because of the influence of what is called "modernism" upon it. But if it be not Orthodox, in the complete sense of that term, it does look upon traditional Judaism as the mother whose breasts have nourished it. It has not the arrogance of Reformed Judaism, which presumes to tell the traditional Jew what of his Judaism he must yield and what he must keep. This new generation looks upon traditional Judaism as the "source of living waters," from which it must drink in order that it may live. It does not go along the path of greatest heat and light, because it cannot. It is a generation of men and of women whose whole upbringing, whose daily activities, and whose cast of mind are such that it would be mere hypocrisy for it to pretend that it accepted for itself, in their completeness, all of the Jewish traditions and Jewish doctrines which Orthodoxy insists upon. On the other hand, this generation is far, far removed from the nakedness and barrenness of the path of snow. It has no patience with the dry-as-dust rationalism and the extreme iconoclasm of what is commonly known as Reformed Judaism. It looks askance upon the vulgarity inherent in the Reform tendency in its endeavour to discredit traditional Jews and Judaism. It looks with pity upon the effort of Reformed Judaism to strip Judaism of its distinctiveness, both in life and in doctrine. Were this generation to attempt to take the path of light, it would perish by reason of the very fullness of light and heat concentrated there these many centuries. And it has no thought of taking the path of snow, for in this generation there are too many who, wandering near this by-path, have felt the rigors of its death-like cold. This new generation is on the King's broad highway, the path which it believes leads through the heart of the Jewish people.

This tendency might have been noted at the recent Conference of American Rabbis held in this city. The worn-out Reform of two or three generations back had lost its power to impose itself upon the Conference; and this because there has grown up a company of younger men who have perceived the futility of the loud and boastful pretence of radical, Reformed Judaism and its "Mission" without missionaries. We now find men who understand that the Judaism of the new generation, to be a living and comprehensive religion and not a matter of a few phrases, must seek to establish contact with the Judaism that has lived and developed throughout our generations.

And you, my friends of this congregation, will find among you the remarkable phenomenon, which may be observed elsewhere as well, that whereas the conflict between parents and the children of a former generation was between parents with Jewish aspirations and children with ambitions away from Judaism, the conflict is now between parents who have become estranged from Judaism and children who have yearnings towards it.

In view of all this, what is to be the attitude of Congregation Emanu-El, with its great power, its fine traditions, and its high position in American Israel? I fear that if we keep on the way of snow, along which we have travelled before—not quite so far, thank God, as others may have gone—we may find that we shall be enveloped by a frigidity and indifference even more startling than may now be the case. We run the danger of an ossified Reform and of an illiberal liberalism and of a smug contentment with the achievements of the past. But if in this congregation there be still the desire for leadership, if we wish to be worthy of ourselves and of our duty to American Israel, we shall boldly and clearly declare to our sister-congregations on the path of snow and to the vast number of Jews and Jewesses as yet without their place in Jewish life, that ours is neither the path of fire nor the path of snow where the angels of death may lurk, but rather the middle path along which we and they must seek our salvation. But if we have not the courage and the insight to attempt to be the leaders of this new generation, or if the desire for leadership has passed from us, we may still keep our stately sanctuary and peals of golden music may be showered as blessings upon us, and our membership may have wealth and station, and by reason of the impetus the past has given us, we may still occupy a proud position; but mark you, from out of the bulk and the body of the Jewish people itself this leadership will come where we are lacking and the Shekinah will rest upon the tents of those who are not lost in the way of the snow.

I want, therefore, from time to time, to try to work out for you and with you the intellectual concepts and a plan of action such as will lead along this path of the golden mean. For we must, once and for all, be clear as to what Judaism is and what the Jews may be, as to the nature of our God and the sanctions of our morality, as to our attitude towards philosophic development and towards the law of our people, as to our conception of our classic and authoritative book, the Bible, and our disposition towards traditional customs and ceremonies, as to our vision for the future, our national and universal hopes. Upon the basis of scholarship and of intimacy with living Judaism, we must seek to become clear as to the whole system of Jewish thought and action underlying our own position.

I know the difficulties of a middle position. It is satisfactory to neither extreme. The putting of an alternative is always a delightful occupation: if not this extreme, then the other. This is particularly delightful for him of a destructive turn of mind, for in such an alternative a justification may easily be found for an abandonment of everything heretofore considered binding. I recognise, too, that in some senses this intermediary position may seem to many as serious an infraction of the Law, and yet without the enthusiasm and courage, as that of the early Reformers. This, however, should not deter us. For the enthusiasm of early Reform is inherent in every revolutionary movement, as yet untried; and besides, those of the new generation are not lacking in enthusiasm and courage of their own. More than this, however, we cannot be charged with undermining the traditional bases of the Torah, for we should be careful to make no claim of absolute validity and finality for the Judaism we evolve. It is not to be regarded as an attempt to convert the Orthodox or the Reformed. It is an attempt merely to give an answer to the questions raised by the new generation and to establish for this generation its proper place in the Jewish life of the present day. Who knows but that, through the influence of this intermediary position, the generation to follow us may not approach the living source of Judaism more closely than we shall be able to do ? Furthermore, it will be impossible to attain finality, because it is my conviction that unless a natural centre be found for Jews and Judaism on our ancestral national soil, the possibilities for the creation of new forms of Jewish life will not be given us. Finally, if this position be called that of compromise, it has at least the merit that it is not a compromise only for the sake of peace or for the sake of yielding anything which we hold dear, but rather a compromise which is to be made solely and alone on the basis of meeting in its fullness the great need of large numbers of our men and women.

This movement may be called by many names. I have already characterised it before you as a Counter-Reformation, and it may be described in other terms. I use the word "Reform" not because I think that it has any intrinsic value, or because it is most expressive of that for which we are striving. We are not seeking reforms in the sense that we are substituting something better for that which is worse. We are striving rather, in every way possible to us, with our modern and changed point of view, to continue and to strengthen in all their truth and beauty the traditions of Israel. The word "Reform," furthermore, is displeasing to me because of the implications that it has in connection with many of the excrescences of the Reformed movement in Judaism during the last century; and it is a term also which is applied to other than religious reforms, and which carries with it a sense of arrogance, and lack of reverence for that which the experience of ages has stored up for us. I use the term nevertheless in order that no one may, in superficial haste, condemn this attitude by casting it aside as being that most feared of bugbears, Orthodoxy.

This movement, furthermore, must be conducted upon a nationalist basis, for only on the assumption that we are a nationality, or a people, or a race, is change in our religious life at all possible. If we be, as the early Reform movement in vain tried to make us and the world believe, a community held together by religious ties alone, the question may fairly be asked, What is the authority in accordance with which changes can come about in a religion? If the authority be a divine, unchangeable Law, the position of the inflexible Orthodox is unassailable. If it be not such objective Law and if there be no further seat of authority, what then beyond the subjective whim and fancy of every individual reformer becomes the standard of Jewish religious change? What then holds such Jews together who are as far removed from each other in their religious beliefs and practices as is the East from the West? And what of such Jews as have no religion, so they say, at all? It is clear that although our religion is the most important part of our lives, as indeed religion is the most important of all human concerns, the tie that connects Jew to Jew, that makes every Jew, wherever he may be, or whatever may be the type of his mind, a member of the Jewish community, has, as its basis, a national or, at all events, a racial element. I am convinced that had the early Reform movement not falsely conceived it to be its duty, in the interests of the political emancipation of the Jews—an emancipation which would have come without this misconception—to deny the existence of Jewish nationality and to insist only upon the retention by the Jewish church of its presumably universalistic content, the Reform movement would have met with much less opposition and with far more permanent results. For, on the basis of nationality, it becomes possible to consult not alone the authority of the Law, but the authority of the Volksgeist, of the people itself. This is, of course, always a difficult matter, for who are the people and what are the organs through which it expresses its will? Upon the answer to these questions depends very largely the form which the Judaism of each new generation must take. We shall, therefore, have to bring convincing evidence for the existence of a Jewish nationality, and then to determine through what channels this nationality makes its will known. To take the middle path, then, will require all that we have of thoughtfulness and of reverence and of courage.

Aye, and deep and deep and deeper let me drink and draw
  From the olden fountain more than light or peace or dream,
Such primeval being as o'erfills the soul with awe,
  Growing one with its silent stream.

Towards the end of to-day's Torah reading, we find Jacob wrestling with the man at the break of the day. Jacob's thigh is wounded; but before the messenger of the night departs, he is forced to bless Jacob, and the name of Jacob is changed to Israel. For this new generation, too, the first streaks of the dawn may be seen; and this generation is still wrestling with forces unknown to it and with powers of darkness. In the struggle that is still before it, it may be wounded and bruised, but if it be loyal and flinch not, it will wrest a blessing for itself. The sun of its new day will melt the snows of the one path, and will merge its warmth with the light of the other path. "And the house of Jacob shall be of fire and the house of Joseph a flame." And then it shall no longer be Jacob, he who grasps at the heel, the imitator, the fearsome laggard, but Israel, the active champion of God, unfurling his banners, folding the tents of an older day and pitching them upon pleasant places for all his marching hosts.

The Free Jewish Organisation

Over sixty German Rabbis and theologians recently published a manifesto with the object of founding a new society to be called "The Free Jewish Organisation" (Freie jüdische Vereinigung). Its purpose is expressed by the name. The organisation or union is to work within the different congregations of the Jews in Germany, or, rather, in conjunction with them, so as not to interfere with existing organisations, but to bring about a new unity. Throughout the German Empire, with a few exceptions—and these fast disappearing—the Jews of one place are united in a single community. Lately the harmony of those communities has been threatened more and more by the extremes of left and right. Both parties are on the brink of a separation and a cleavage. The power of the communities—whereof it is particularly true that union is strength—is now menaced by divisions into small groups with clear demarcations of divergent religious views.

This movement entails serious danger to the communities; and to counteract it it is necessary to insist on unity, to urge that energies shall not be frittered away in dissensions, to emphasise that which is essential and common to all and set aside the points of difference, or to reconcile them through private effort and a spirit of self-sacrifice. Nobody's religious views are to be interfered with. Whatever the individual wants to believe or not to believe, his attitude towards the ceremonies, whether he practises few or many of them—all this is his private concern, for which he has to answer only to his conscience. Nobody can give him any hard and fast rules, which can be found only on the orthodox basis of the recognition of the authority of the Schulchan Aruch and its commentaries.

The Free Jewish Organisation does not recognise the necessity of such constraint. It is a free union, and would not limit the freedom of any of its members; but it desires to be the rallying point for all those who have at heart the preservation of the community and its institutions. The motto, "Everything or nothing," is impracticable in religious matters. There is no party capable of applying this motto to its logical end, so as ruthlessly to cut the knot. Each party must make concessions and come to some compromise. A religion which can look back over so long a history and so many changes as the Jewish religion cannot in one day re-create itself entirely so as to be transformed into its very opposite. Some of the most extreme proposals must be withdrawn, since their realisation would be frustrated by the actual facts of life.

The Free Jewish Organisation fully recognises the fundamental ideas of the Liberal movement. It allows every one the freedom of his convictions; it accepts the principle of the capacity and scope for development in Judaism. It realises the impulse towards, nay, the necessity, of further religious development. But it demands that this religious development shall come through *religious* motives, to enlarge the place of religion in life and to strengthen pious practice. Principles and considerations foreign or even opposed to all religion should not be the standards set for reform and religious development, which must spring from the inward need for religion. Only genuine struggles of conscience and soul can demand and win consideration at our hands. Where these struggles actually take place they make themselves felt and work themselves out in a very different way from what we generally see nowadays. The Free Jewish Organisation does not shut itself off from existing circumstances. It looks facts straight in the face; it is not blind to the fact that modern tendencies are against it, but it sees the schism and the necessity of filling in the breach, and so of warding off the danger that threatens. A reconciliation between the parties of the left and right must be attempted; it is getting more and more difficult, but it must and will be brought about when that which unites us all is brought more to the fore; when once again the fundamental principle is declared that religious spirit and the piety of the heart are essentials, and that higher than the precepts of orthodoxy, higher than the issues of reform, are the preservation and strengthening of Judaism.

Judaism, or rather the Jewish communities, are in a peculiar position when they have to face onslaught from any quarter. We have not, as has the Christian Church, one central authority to test the opinions of its believers, determining their correctness and practicability, and with the power of promulgating laws and creeds for general acceptance. The Jewish communities are completely isolated. A chance majority in a committee, even the personal influence of one single member, is often sufficient to determine the views and practice of a congregation, and so to give it a character altogether different from neighbouring communities. This causes a ceaseless spirit of innovation, unrest, and disunion which does no good, because these changes are rather the outcome of personal caprice and irresponsibility than a real sign of healthy development. The abuses arising out of the absence of any fixed constitution must be limited by the principle of individual loyalty to Jewish consciousness. To emphasise this principle will be a further task of the Free Jewish Organisation which will not allow the idea of the individual, or his passing impression, to become the rule of the congregation, but will test his thought by its harmony with Judaism and its capacity to further real Jewish development. The thread of history cannot suddenly be broken off; we must continue to weave it and spin with it. History has passed its verdict on the possibility of certain combinations and the effect of some developments. Some institutions were indications of progress in their time, and yet they did not persist; some which were once effective have been outlived and serve no purpose in existing circumstances. The only real criterion is knowledge of Judaism, its history, and its purpose, and the furthering of Jewish knowledge is one of the most important tasks which the Free Jewish Organisation has set itself to carry out.

But its greatest and most striking function still remains to be told. Above all else it wishes to devote itself to *positive* religious work. Probably no country is as irreligious as Germany, especially North Germany. We cannot here enter into the causes that have brought about the present chaos. From it a new structure must be built. It is useless to try single reforms and to apply petty remedies. Here religion is shaken to its very roots, and the task of setting it straight again is one of immense difficulty. Here there still reigns the senseless notion that it is a sign of enlightenment to be indifferent to religion, a mark of culture to deny God, Providence, and Immortality, to make free with all religious institutions and festivals. To combat this modern tendency it is necessary to clear the ground from the start, to make a solid foundation, and to build on it a firm, immovable structure. The spirit of the times is hostile to such an effort. We may not ignore the fact that the ideals of the present age are remote from religion. Wealth and pleasure are its gods; yet our goal is so high that we shall not despair but go forth to the work with strength and energy. "Let us be strong and of good courage for our people and our God." With this motto of our old time prophets does the "Free Jewish Organisation" start its work.

I. Elbogen, Berlin.

The Jewish Territorial Organisation

[Extracted from a paper read by H. M. Kisch, C.S.I., at a Symposium of the West End Jewish Literary Society.]

THE Ito or Jewish Territorial Organisation is a political body, inasmuch as it is concerned with the subject of nations and government. According to its constitution, " the object of the organisation is to procure a territory upon an autonomous basis for those Jews who cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they at present live" ; and in the same article of the constitution it is explained that " the expression ' autonomous basis ' means and implies that the territory shall be one in which autonomy shall be attainable, and in which the predominant majority of the population shall be Jewish."

The territory is not necessarily to be an independent land of our own. It may be anywhere in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, or Australasia. The territory must be open to Jews from other lands—to all Jews who are driven out of their own country by force or persecution or fear. Therefore the territory must be large. Also it must be secure against legislation prohibiting the admission of Jews.

It is these two necessities, the necessities of space and security, which gave rise to the condition that the territory must be on an " autonomous basis," that is to say, a territory large enough and so constituted that autonomy shall be attainable, and in which the predominant majority of the population shall be Jewish. The more important of these two conditions is that the majority of the population shall be Jewish. Even despotic countries must in time become constitutional ;

and in any constitutional country a sufficiently large measure of autonomy is attainable in the ordinary course of progress for any territory which would be large enough to serve permanently as a refuge and home for persecuted Jews.

Without a predominant Jewish population there would, however, be no means of preventing legislation against Jewish immigrants; and reason and experience alike show that such legislation would close the door at a very early stage. Human nature is to-day the same as it was in the time of Pharaoh. The actual possessor of anything loves the monopoly of it, whether it be land or a trade or labour, and resents competition—especially the competition of aliens and foreigners.

. . . .

It is sad that such a land—an Ito-land, as we call it—should be desirable; but we hold that it is impossible to take a calm view of the Jewish situation without seeing that such a land is desirable if it can be obtained. The Jews of the world are about 11½ millions in number. That is more than the population of Norway and Sweden combined, more than the population of Canada, Persia, Egypt, Belgium, Portugal, or the whole of Australasia. In every country Jews are in a small minority, varying in countries of any importance from a little more than one-half per cent in the United Kingdom to between four and five per cent in Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Roumania. Where we are absolutely insignificant in numbers we are tolerated and even welcomed. When we become even one-half per cent of the population, as in England, the note of alarm is sounded in many quarters and measures are taken both in our own body and outside it to prevent any considerable increase of the Jewish population from outside. When our numbers rise to four per cent of the population we are regarded as a political and economic danger and are subject to outbursts of anti-Semitic prejudice, which can be, and is, readily worked upon so as to raise pogroms, outrage, and massacre. One-half of the Jews of the world are unable to live in even tolerable conditions in the lands in which they now are, and any transfer of population without the security of a predominant Jewish majority in the country of destination tends to aggravate the condition of the Jews already living in that country.

Although an Ito-land would furnish a solution of the Jewish question, it is certainly not easy to obtain such a land, and the process of building it up will be slow. Is there no alternative? . . . Itoists are very much like other Jews. We all have the same ideals before us. We all look forward to the time when the myths and legends which turned a Jewish sect into a new and aggressive creed shall be discarded, and when all men shall worship at the same shrine. That, however, is too far an outlook. The solution of assimilation is, we hope and believe, no nearer. For unless assimilation means the attainment of the ideal just mentioned it must mean the acceptance of doctrines and myths against which we have stood throughout our dispersion and in protest against which our fathers suffered and died and our brethren are still suffering. The degradation of that solution we do not contemplate.

There remains the solution of emancipation in every country. There are few men who have been firmer believers and warmer advocates of this solution than Mr. Claude Montefiore. Let me quote, therefore, what he said on the subject only a year ago.

"You know only too well that the Russian outlook remains dark, gloomy, and unrelieved for our unfortunate co-religionists. The forces of reaction, intolerance, misanthropy, the abominable machinations of religious hatreds, continue unchecked and unabated. There have been, it is true, in the last year no pogroms upon a large scale, to which the attention of the civilised world is compelled to be drawn. But all the more safely it would seem can the various authorities within or above the law pursue their policy of persecution in detail, a policy which is perhaps more terrible, more cunning, and more disastrous in its effects than anything which has yet taken place. It is no wonder that the saying, ' The Jewish question in Russia can only be solved in Russia,' however justified, is met, both within and without Russia, with some derision and impatience and incredulity."

And then, further on in the same address :

" Naturally to some of us it is a bitter thing that one should have to speak so despondently fifty years after our own complete emancipation in England has been achieved. The proud ideal contained in the simple words, ' Englishmen of the Jewish faith '—that proud ideal, realised in England fifty years ago and still proudly and lovingly maintained to-day, we had hoped would become the realised or realisable ideal for every country in Europe. Perhaps we had not measured sufficiently the honest passion for liberty and equality of the Anglo-Saxon race on the one hand, the intolerance and sluggish growth and virulent hatreds of many races upon the other. Or perhaps more temperately it may be said we had not taken human nature sufficiently into account."

I agree with Mr. Montefiore that he and those who looked with him for a speedy solution from emancipation had not taken human nature sufficiently into account. I do not agree with him as to the great difference between the Anglo-Saxon race and other races in this matter. Human nature is much the same all the world over, and I doubt if the Indians in South Africa, the Chinese and Japanese in America, the negroes in the Southern States, or the coloured races excluded from Australia would endorse Mr. Montefiore's certificate as to the ardent passion of the Anglo-Saxon race for liberty and equality. In justice, too, we must remember that Jews were allowed to live and multiply in many other countries when they were denied a residence in England. Russia may be several hundreds of years behind England in civilisation, but that is not the sole cause, or even the chief cause, of the Jewish question in Russia.

The real cause of anti-Semitism and of the disadvantageous position of the Jew in almost every country in comparison with his physical, intellectual, and moral equals of the dominant creeds is due to the marked differences between the Jew and his fellow-countrymen—differences of race, religion, and customs, which hinder intimate intercourse and prevent intermarriage. Differences cause prejudice and dislike, and it is folly to ignore this fact of human nature. . . .

The reason which prevents Russia and Roumania from giving the rights of citizens to their own Jews is really the same reason that prevents England, the United States, and other countries from admitting alien immigrants without restriction.

The reason was clearly stated by Mr. Balfour in the Committee on the Aliens Bill. He said, "A state of things could easily be imagined in which it would not be to the advantage of the civilisation of the country that there should be an immense body of persons who, however patriotic, able, and industrious—however much they threw themselves into the national life, still by their own action remained a people apart, and not merely held a religion differing from the vast majority of their fellow countrymen, but only intermarried among themselves." We may, and I at least do, question the applicability of Mr. Balfour's argument to the particular case then before Parliament, but we can hardly dispute the force or weight of his statement. . . .

If, then, the Jewish question cannot wait for the ideal of a universal religion, if the degradation of assimilation is rejected, if the solution in Russia is beyond any measurable distance of time, and if emigration to countries without the special features of an Ito-land is only a transfer or an aggravation of our trouble, there remains no alternative to the Ito's solution.

But where is our Ito-land to be, and how is it to arise? That is more than can be told to-day. No man can tell how the future will work out, but it may be that an Ito-land is already founded and in process of development. There are several ways in which an Ito-land may arise. It may be by the growth of a Jewish population in a new or unpeopled territory to be deliberately developed as an Ito-land. It may be by a gradual and peaceful but deliberate penetration into some territory or state with now a sparse population. It may be by the combined action or influence of powerful nations, or of an international congress such as has before now been advocated by persons outside our community who realise that the present position of 11½ millions of Jews cannot continue indefinitely and calls for a radical solution. Or lastly, it may be that the streams of wandering Jews driven from their homes by intolerance and persecution will, without deliberation and unconsciously, so direct their movements that at some date, more or less distant, and in some territory not now to be designated, there will be found a predominant Jewish majority. If such an Ito-land should arise in Palestine alone, or combined with adjacent territory, it would accord with the hope and desire of the Zionist section of Itoists, but wherever it may be it will fulfil the object of the Ito.

. . . .

Zionism after the Ninth Congress

THE ninth Congress marks yet another stage in the slow and painful process of evolution through which the Zionist movement is passing. The priceless (if unappreciated) legacy of ideas which Herzl left to his people was marred by the presence of certain elements that were foreign to the idea of Zionism pure and simple. That idea may be defined, broadly, as the reconstitution of Jewish life—that is, the creation of conditions in which the essential character of the Jewish people could express and develop itself fully and freely as of old. That those conditions can only be realised in the historical country of the Jews is a truism, and is sufficiently recognised by the very name of Herzl's movement. But there was also prominent in Herzl's mind another idea, which had no necessary connection with the essence of Zionism—the idea of providing a "home of refuge" for persecuted Jews. This alien element was expelled from Zionism some years ago, and is now embodied in the Territorialist movement. The separation of Territorialism from Zionism leaves the Zionists free to pursue their own proper aim, and is therefore a fact which they may legitimately regard with satisfaction.

But the Territorialist idea, if it was the most dangerous feature of the Herzlian legacy, was for that very reason the least difficult to throw out. It was dangerous because it was in essence opposed to the fundamental idea of Zionism; but that being so, its presence in Herzl's original scheme could only be due to the fact that he started with an insufficient understanding of the problem which he was setting out to solve. Thus in getting rid of Territorialism the Zionist movement—Herzl's own Zionist movement—was simply getting rid of something with which it ought never to have had any connection. But it is otherwise with another element of Herzl's original scheme—the element that may be called "Charterism." The idea that the Jews were to return to Palestine (that is, to a country forming part of a decrepit Turkish Empire) armed with a charter signed and sealed by the European Powers—this idea was not present in Herzl's plan by a mere accident; it was the very corner-stone of his project. The impress of the charter idea was on all the institutions of the Zionist movement from the beginning. The Jewish Colonial Trust was to become a power in the western financial world, whereby the charter could be bought at the right moment. The National Fund was to go on accumulating, until land in Palestine could be purchased on a large scale under the security afforded by the charter. And in the meantime the leaders of the movement—the elected of the people, as represented by its parliament, the Congress—were to maintain diplomatic relations with the governments of Europe until the time should arrive for the winning of the charter. Thus "charterism" was of the very essence of Herzl's Zionism; it was, in fact, what distinguished the new political movement from the despised *Chibbath Zion*. If, therefore, the idea of a charter is dead and buried to-day—as Dr. Nordau declared it to be at the recent Congress—then Zionism has made a radical departure from the lines laid down for it by the leader whose name is still a name to conjure with. The departure began, indeed, as long ago as 1905, when the Russian engineer Ussischkin's programme of "peaceful penetration" was accepted by the seventh Congress. But the influence of Herzl, even after his death, was so strong that the natural course of development could not have brought about the complete abandonment of his main idea for many years to come. Only some unexpected change in the conditions, which might have weaned Herzl himself from charterism, had he lived, could induce his successors to give it up. And so the charter has been buried, not because the idea of waiting till we could buy Palestine under international guarantees is in itself wrong, and always was wrong, but because the conditions now are not what they were in 1895.

The conditions have been changed, of course, by the revolution in Turkey.

The ninth Congress, as the first that had met since the revolution, had to state in clear terms its recognition of that fact; and it could have had no better spokesman than Dr. Nordau. Opinions may differ as to the cogency of the argument by which he attempted to show that the Basle programme was never intended to contain any specific reference to international guarantees. But on the main point he was explicit and emphatic. He declared the charter idea dead, and at the same time dissociated that idea from the fundamental aims of Zionism. The fulfilment of Zionist hopes in Palestine, he said in effect, involves no menace to the unity of the Turkish Empire; on the contrary, the Jewish settlement of the future will be a settlement of loyal Ottoman subjects, anxious to promote the welfare of the whole of which they will form a part. But Zionists cannot take advantage of the constitutional régime to win Palestine at the expense of their ideals. If we were offered the fullest rights in Palestine on condition not merely of becoming Ottoman subjects, but of giving up our own language, of adopting a non-Jewish system of education, of forfeiting the possibility of developing our national individuality—in a word, of becoming "Turks of the Jewish persuasion," as so many of us have become Englishmen, Frenchmen, or Germans of the Jewish persuasion—then we should have to refuse, and to postpone the realisation of our hopes yet further. Thus the burial of the charter was accompanied by something even more important—by an unequivocal declaration of the essentially "cultural" nature of the Zionist ideal. To say this is not to accuse Dr. Nordau, or the Congress as a whole, of adopting a purely "kultur" Zionism, or, in other words, of disregarding the means, and paying exclusive attention to the end. Zionism after the ninth Congress remains what it always has been: an organised attempt to settle a large number of Jews in Palestine. But Dr. Nordau's speech means that the end that lies beyond—the full development of the Jewish spirit—is not wholly obscured by the immediate object.

Zionism, then, emerges from the ninth Congress with its attitude to the new Turkish situation satisfactorily defined. That is so much gained. But there is still a great deal to be done in the way of accommodating the concrete organisation of the movement to its new outlook. For, though the charter is officially dead, the affairs of the movement are still conducted largely in the spirit of the charter policy.

Herzl's policy involved, as we have seen, the building up of a powerful "financial instrument" by means of the Jewish Colonial Trust; the hoarding of a great accumulation of capital for the purchase of land under the name of the Jewish National Fund; and the maintenance of diplomatic relations with European governments. It involved also the idea that the Zionist Congress was a parliament of the Jewish people, designed mainly to impress on the outside world, by its mere existence, the fact that the Jews were playing a part, as a people, in international politics. Now the charter policy had to some extent been undermined from within before the ninth Congress. Under stress of the programme of "peaceful penetration," the Trust and the National Fund had begun to sink capital in Palestine; the movement had initiated various practical schemes in that country; diplomatic activity had fallen into the background, or been discontinued altogether; and the Congress had become more and more an assembly of Zionists bent on furthering the practical work of their movement, less and less an attempt to demonstrate the (non-existent) political power of the Jewish people as such. The ninth Congress, having killed the charter, might have been expected to vindicate these tendencies once for all, and to get rid of the "charterist" tendencies which still remained to counteract them. Unfortunately, it has done so only in theory, not in practice.

It is obvious that the policy which commends itself to the majority of Zionists at any given time will not be carried out thoroughly, unless it is entrusted to an executive which is in thorough sympathy with the majority. But if the ninth Congress proved anything, it proved beyond doubt that the men who have had the guidance of the movement since the eighth Congress were not in sympathy with what may be called the "forward" policy—the policy of pushing on little by little the practical work of developing the resources of Palestine by means of Jewish settlers. It is no injustice to the leaders of the Zionist movement to say that they have not completely freed themselves from the "charterist" influence; indeed, it was not to be expected that they should. For the Zionism of Herzl, and of those whom he brought into the movement, rests on other foundations than that of a large section of the Russian Zionists, who are mainly responsible for the "forward" tendency. The nationalism of the assimilated German Jew, who is driven to Zionism because he realises the hopelessness of any other attempt to combat anti-Semitism, is different from the nationalism of the Russian Jew, whose whole outlook is influenced by an atmosphere and a training which are at least unconsciously nationalistic. In the one case it is a reaction against something external, coloured by that against which it reacts, and is even in some instances a mere aping of German or Austrian chauvinism; in the other it is an inevitable result of the influence of Jewish ideals. Now it is this second kind of nationalism which expresses itself (whether as *Chibbath Zion* or as Zionism) in a desire to promote the steady growth of the Jewish settlement in Palestine. But the leaders of the Zionist movement have been drawn almost exclusively from countries in which circumstances have not been favourable to this kind of nationalism; and it is therefore not surprising that they have not been and are not enthusiastic about the "forward" policy. They are, of course, theoretically in favour of "practical work in Palestine"; probably there is no Zionist to-day who is not. But in actual practice they are at best a brake on the wheel. They still cling to the remnants of a policy which forms, as I have tried to show, an essential part of the charter idea—the policy of waiting. A Congress, therefore, which buried the charter could not safely leave the control of the movement almost exclusively in the hands of these men. It could only hope to get its policy whole-heartedly carried out by securing an effective representation for the "forward" tendency. But the ninth Congress did not succeed in creating a new executive. The efforts made in that direction proved futile, because the proposal to introduce new elements into the governing body did not commend itself to the German delegates. Hence the ninth Congress, though it killed the charter idea, cannot be said to have killed "charterism"; that task must be left for the tenth.

There is at the present time no single representative of the forward policy who possesses the confidence of the whole body of Zionists, and is capable of impressing that policy on the movement by the force of his individuality. This fact, so long as it remains a fact, will make it very difficult, if not impossible, for the will of the majority to make itself effectively felt in the guidance of the movement. Thus the task of the tenth

Congress is likely to be no easy one, and the Congress may not succeed in securing a complete victory for the forward tendency. But if the movement is to live and progress, it will have to make at least a beginning, to take at least the first step towards overthrowing the last stronghold of charterism.

LEON SIMON.

Reviews of Books

The Synoptic Gospels. With an Introduction and a Commentary by C. G. Montefiore. Macmillan & Co., Ltd. Vols. I and II, 1910. 18s. net.

Mr. Montefiore's volumes are a manifesto on behalf of Liberal Judaism. They are a sequel to his Hibbert Lectures and his edition of the Old Testament in *The Bible for Home Reading.* Like this latter work, the book on the Synoptic Gospels has been specially written for Jewish readers. We look forward with genuine interest to the third volume, which is to contain a series of Additional Notes by Mr. Israel Abrahams. Apart from the lengthy introduction, which covers 108 pages, the first volume contains the Gospel of Mark with a very exhaustive commentary. The second deals similarly with Matthew and Luke. The work is "tentative," and being written from Mr. Montefiore's "peculiar point of view," disclaims any pretence to learning. To our mind there is also less of discretion than of valour in his attempt to bring the New Testament into Jewish homes, and to lead his co-religionists to the view that Jesus "entirely resembles Amos, Isaiah, and Ezekiel" (lxxxvii). Isaiah revealed the holiness of God, Amos taught men the righteousness of God, and Ezekiel that the individual soul was infinitely precious in the eyes of the Heavenly Father—but he also taught that each soul must bear its own burden of guilt; finally Hosea taught that love is the abiding essence of God's nature. Jews have heard of Jesus for nearly nineteen hundred years without ever associating him with their prophets. Nor is his teaching in line with theirs. We hear in it nothing about the holiness of God, which is not once referred to in the Gospels. The righteousness of God is lost sight of in theories of election and predestination. The love of God is only reserved for such as believe in Jesus. The Jews are disinherited, they are to be excluded from the kingdom of God (p. 478), and at the last judgment they will look in vain for mercy.

We are amazed by the reverence and affection displayed by Montefiore for Jesus. But we are still more amazed that, although practically the entire commentary is borrowed, Montefiore quotes only authors like Carpenter, Loisy, Wellhausen, Holtzmann, Johannes Weiss, who have neither knowledge of nor interest in the Jewish standpoint. There is an *entire* absence of reference to Jewish authorities in these bulky volumes. Abraham Geiger, Joel, Güdemann, Cohn of Marburg, and Lazarus have all something to say about Jesus and the Gospels that would have been of real interest to the *Jewish* readers of *The Synoptic Gospels.* And we ought to have heard more of the critical views of David Friedrich Strauss, Renan, Pfleiderer, F. C. Conybeare, H. Usener, I. G. Frazer, and Westermarck. We presume that references to Wünsche's *Neue Beiträge* will appear in Volume III. We note gladly that Montefiore occasionally defends the Jewish and Rabbinic side (pp. 232–3, 466); and his attack on Merx, who charges the Scribes with neglecting the spirit of the Law, is a piece of fine work. Equal to it is the refutation of J. Weiss's views as to the lack of "*Innigkeit*" in the Rabbinic religion (p. 683). Montefiore is at his best in defending such aspects of Judaism as are retained by Liberal Jews, but his exposition of Liberal Judaism (see pages 594 and 1099) leaves little to differentiate it from that modern phase of Christianity preached in the New Theology, and known as Unitarianism.

His exaltation of Jesus, moreover, leads him at times to conclusions remarkable for their unfairness to Jews and Judaism. Whatever is fine and noble in the Gospels must be genuine; but if anything attributed to Jesus be immoral, cruel, or base, it *cannot* possibly have been uttered by Jesus! Thus in the story of the Gadarene swine (pp. 136 ff.) we have the preposterous notion that the "incidents are perhaps part of a popular Jewish tale, unconnected originally with the life of Jesus." We would refer Montefiore to his own remarks on page 140: "How pure and free the prophets are from the superstitious ideas about demons and demoniac possession to which Jesus, like many others of his time, was a victim!"

He approves, again, the principle of Jesus that there is "no such thing as *religious* impurity in a material sense"; which cuts athwart the whole scheme of dietary laws, and abrogates the distinction between clean and unclean that forms an important part of Jewish life. This is one of the most inept principles in the Gospels, and was early disregarded by Paul (1 Cor. x. 18, ff.), and by the entire Church in various ways. The institution of the Eucharist again revived the notion of food as something *sacred.* In the *Didache* (Chap. IX) we read: "The Eucharist is that 'holy thing' which may not be given to '*the dogs*'"—i.e. the unbaptised Jews or heathens (see Holtzmann, p. 123). Is not drunkenness the curse of England, the cause of nearly all the crime and misery? Yet Montefiore approves of the saying, "There is nothing outside a man, which entering into him can make him unclean" (Mark vii. 15 and 18).

We are in hearty agreement with the statement (p. 175) that "the seat of impurity, as of purity, is the heart, the will"; but this is also the teaching of the Book of Proverbs (iv. 23) and of other books of the Old Testament, of Philo and the Rabbis, quite independently of the New Testament, and by no means involves the abrogation of the dietary laws.

In the commentary on Chapter VII, verse 27 (p. 178) Montefiore says, "'Dog' was a frequent term of abuse and contempt used by Jews about Gentiles." We unhesitatingly challenge this statement. It is not found, as far as we know, in the whole of the Talmud. But it does occur in Christian literature, e.g. in the passage quoted from *Didache*, Chapter IX, and in Mark vii. 27. We suggest that Montefiore wrote this relying upon non-Jewish authorities. Cheyne says in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (art. "Dog"), col. 1125, "In later times the Gentiles were called dogs (Niddah, 77*a*, Baba Kama, 49*a*); but the Talmudic use has no biblical authority; Mark vii. 27 surely does not express what may be called *biblical* doctrine." Cheyne is quite wrong in his Talmudic references. Niddah, 77*a* is not to be found; 73*a* is the last page of this book. If the reference should be Niddah, 17*a* there is no reference to "dog" as a term of abuse. In Baba Kama, 49*a* there is also no reference to "dog" as a term of abuse for Gentiles. Such misstatements would not have been made, if Jewish scholarship instead of Christian authority had been relied on by the author. A similar error occurs on page 124: "They who are without" was "used also of the heathen." This is not correct. In the Talmud the term applies to Jews whose heresies excluded them from the orthodox body. Montefiore's attack on the Talmud on page 225 may be compared with Harnack's attack on the teaching of the Pharisees, as a work containing good things, "aber sie hatten leider noch sehr viel anderes daneben" (*Das Wesen des Christentums*, p. 31). He compares the New Testament with the Talmud, which is, from the critical standpoint, quite unfair. The New Testament must be compared with Philo, Josephus, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and not with the Talmud, which was compiled much later. One of the strangest features of Montefiore's book is the entire absence of reference to Philo or to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, which, as Dr. Charles has proved, was so much used by Matthew. Dr. Charles' edition is only once referred to.

The extent to which Montefiore goes in accepting Christian notions is shown by his treatment of the resurrection. He deals with this subject on pages 383–5. He believes in the "subjective vision" of the resurrection, but says, "Nevertheless, I do not think that the objective vision possibility could not be held by a Jew." Again he says: "When I think of the gigantic results of both Christianity and Mohammedanism, it seems to me, in some moods and for some reasons, less difficult to believe that they are based upon, or partly built up from, certain special divine interventions than that they are based upon what we call 'illusions.'" Do we depend on our *moods* for our beliefs?

It is quite impossible to deal here with the important problems relating to the attitude of Jesus towards sinners and tax-collectors (pp. 84 ff.), the Sabbath (pp. 90 ff.), divorce (pp. 234–42), the greatest commandment (pp. 286–90), the arrest, trial, and death of Jesus (pp. 341–71). On all these matters we find ourselves at variance with Montefiore. He summarises the interpretation of the Gospels thus (pp. 315–6): "Thus do the commentators weave hypothesis to hypothesis, and add argument to argument. They play among the shadows of an irrecoverable past. Happy are they, as to me it seems, whose religion does not depend too greatly—happiest they whose religion does not depend at all—upon the historic accuracy of a miraculous and quasi-legendary narrative, written for purposes of edification or conversion by excitable and credulous men, to whom the sovereign sacredness of historic fact was a distant and unknown conception." If this be so, why, we ask, did Montefiore compile such another commentary?

It is remarkable, again, that Montefiore does not do justice to the numerous parallels in the Old Testament to passages in the Gospels. "The lesson of Gethsemane speaks to all," says the author (p. 338). "'Not what I will, but what Thou wilt.'" Are there not many passages in the Old Testament quite as fine containing the same truth, e.g. 1 Samuel III. 18, or Job I. 21? It is true that Loisy is sharply criticised for not having read many of the numerous books which give some of the Rabbinic parallels to Gospel teaching (p. 482). But Montefiore lays himself open to the same charge; though Mr. Abrahams will, no doubt, save the turning of tables against his book in this respect. The Sermon on the Mount will afford an excellent opportunity of comparing the teaching of Jesus with the Old Testament and Rabbinic teaching. The references given at present to the sources whence

Matthew took so much of the sermon are by no means satisfactory; the most Jewish of all the New Testament passages should surely have been treated as fully as possible from a Jewish standpoint. In the commentary on the Golden Rule (pp. 549–50) not a word is said as to the Old Testament positive form, which Jesus undoubtedly had in mind in his paraphrase, "All then that ye would that men should do to you, so do ye also unto them: for this is the Law and the Prophets." Here Jesus surely referred to "Love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18), of which Hillel's famous saying was also a Targum or paraphrase. It is true that Hillel's form of the Golden Rule was negative, but why does not Montefiore tell his Jewish readers that in some texts of the New Testament the negative form of the Golden Rule is to be found (*Hand-Commentar. zum Neuen Testament*, Holtzmann's remarks on p. 382). It is so quoted by Irenæus (3, 12, 14) and Cyprian (*Test*, III. 119), which seems to show that the early Church fathers preferred the negative form.

Again, Montefiore is prone to accept anti-Jewish interpretations when they are historically unwarrantable, as in his statement that Matthew v. 10–12 "seems to reflect the first persecutions of the Christians at the hands of the Jews" (p. 483). What authority, we ask, apart from the New Testament (which is a partisan authority) has Montefiore for this statement? It will not be disregarded by the unfriendly critics of the Jewish people. Joël, in his *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (II, pp. 73 ff.) would have taught Montefiore better than the New Testament. If Montefiore were correct in his assumption that these verses (Matt. v. 10–12) reflect the first persecutions of the Christians at the hands of the Jews, the date when these verses were interpolated would have to be after 116 C.E. (see Joel, I, pp. 14 ff.). In any case the "first persecutions of the Christians at the hands of the Jews" would be more correctly expressed as the first defensive measures taken by the Jews in view of the hostile attitude adopted by the Christians, who were both anti-national and anti-legal, towards the Jews of Palestine, in whose midst they lived.

Some of the least satisfactory passages in the commentary are the remarks of Montefiore in his attempt to support the superiority of the Gospels to the Jewish teachings. Thus on page 545 we are told: "What is remarkable about the sayings of the Gospels is that they are often applicable to wholly alien conditions, and true even without that belief in the end of the world which underlies so many of them—no surer mark of their genius and first-classness." Nothing in the way of proof is added. We are to take Montefiore's judgment as all-sufficient. Yet it is noteworthy that again and again, in the chapter where the above passage is found, we are told that we cannot use the rules of Jesus for our daily life. Herein is an essential difference between Jewish and Christian teaching. Strauss, Mill, Mazzini, and others have indeed made it a ground for objection to the teaching of Jesus that he fails to affect the real affairs of life, a criticism which could never be directed against the Jewish legalised morality. The failure of Christianity to live up to the teaching of Jesus (see p. 524) is the practical commentary that will appeal to the Jew more powerfully than any argument adduced by Montefiore.

Does Montefiore think that the Christian idea expressed by the term "for Jesus' sake" is greater and better than the Jewish idea "for the sake of God"? (p. 754). Jews have lived and died for the sake of God for more than four thousand years. Is this record of no value? Do the Jews need a higher stimulus than the old Jewish ideal—"for the sake of Heaven," or "for the sake of God"? That stimulus enables us to accept with joy what others regard as the "bondage of the Law"—a designation which we are glad to see Montefiore rightly designates "unhistorical" (p. 499).

It is significant to see how Montefiore defends Jesus. The untrue statement, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy" (Matt. v. 43) is ingeniously disposed of by the remark, "We need not suppose that Jesus was guilty of such a mis-quotation, in order to score a point and to sharpen a contrast" (p. 518). This is like the criterion adopted by Dr. Martineau and other Unitarians, that only such sayings and teachings to which no ethical or religious objection can be taken, can have proceeded from the mouth of Jesus. Montefiore thinks it fair to shift the blame from Jesus to the redactor or the evangelist. As for the principle, "love your enemies," we agree with Montefiore's remarks: "The evangelist was bid to love his enemies: we may well doubt whether he did so" (p. 519). Jesus himself called the Pharisees "vipers" and "children of hell," and was equally false to his own teaching. He, too, introduced a harsh note in calling the heathen "dogs and swine." No prophet of Israel ever used such words.

Montefiore frequently dwells on the "pity" motive of Jesus.

"In this pity, this profound and yearning compassion, there lies probably a true and fundamental characteristic of the historic Jesus" (p. 573). We should like proof to support this statement. Jesus is said to have felt pity for the *people* (Matt. IX. 36). But in Matthew Jesus excludes all the *people* (Matt. VIII. 12) from the peace and happiness of his kingdom, and without the least pity, sentences them to "the outer darkness: to weeping and gnashing of teeth." Montefiore asks, is the story in which these *pitiless* words occur historical? (p. 559); but he does not ask the question in the opposite case, Matthew IX. 36 (p. 573).

Montefiore is determined at all costs not to allow the possibility of Jesus speaking of himself as the Son of God in the unique sense claimed by the Church. The fact is, however, that the Gospels and the other New Testament writings are very explicit (1) in ascribing this unique sonship to Jesus; and (2) in making him assert this relationship to God. The verse in Matthew, XI. 27, is supported by Luke X. 22, and by several passages in John, as well as by Mark XIII. 32. This last reference is to be found, according to Montefiore (p. 605), in a *late* chapter in Mark. We find that Montefiore considers this verse "most likely to be authentic" (p. 299). If this be the case, why say "it seems hard to believe that Jesus uttered these words"—that he was the Son of God? This is an example of the contradictions that occur in the book. Dalman has pointed out that Jesus claims this title of Son in the parable of the wicked husbandmen (*The Words of Jesus*, p. 280). If any saying was ever uttered by Jesus, there is none more likely to be genuine than Matthew XI. 27. First, there is strong patristic evidence in its favour (see Justin's *Apol.* I. 63, and Marcion in *Tert.* c. Marc. 2, 27), and Schmiedel, Bousset, and Sanday agree with Harnack in regarding it as an original utterance of Jesus.

Again, much of the Gospel story depends on the assumption that Jesus was the only divine Son. His claim (1) to forgive sins, (2) to set himself above the Law and above all the prophets, (3) to consider all men as sinners, (4) to be the object of men's faith, (5) to judge humanity and so on, all depend on the supposed fact that he is the only Son of God. Montefiore tells us that his doubts as to the genuineness of Matthew XI. 27 "are partly due to the WISH that Jesus may not have said these words, for did he do so, he seems less great and more mistaken" (p. 616). We wish that Montefiore had made more liberal use of this admission as to the criterion which he uses for establishing the genuineness of the sayings of Jesus. Later Jesus is said to have been "an ardent and convinced Unitarian" (p. 782), a view which is only possible by denying two fundamental propositions, on which the whole of the New Testament and Christianity rest: (1) that Jesus was the *only* Son of God (see p. 850), (2) that Jesus was the only one who could speak of God as *My* Father (see p. 864), or, as John expresses it, "I and the Father are one" (John x. 30). According to the New Testament writers Jesus was not "an ardent and convinced Unitarian." Jews can only judge the personality of Jesus from the records in the New Testament, and it is hardly fair for Montefiore to present Jesus in any other light. He wishes the Gospels to rank with the Pentateuch (p. 594), and if Jews can only infer their conclusions of the character, say, of Moses or Abraham from the statements in the Pentateuch, so with Jesus we *must* rely upon the Gospel for the story of his life. We refuse to cut out all the "terrible," "horrible," "immoral" sayings because we do not *like* them (see pp. 750, 752, 754, 759, and 771).

Finally, Montefiore believes that "the religion of the future will be a developed and purified Judaism, but from that developed and purified Judaism the records which tell, however imperfectly, of perhaps the greatest, as certainly of its most potent and influential teacher, will not be excluded. The roll-call of its heroes will not omit the name of Jesus." (p 594).

Heroism, however admirable in itself, has more than once led men astray, and we cannot but remember that the teaching of Jesus was a rejection of that Kingdom of God which was based on the Law of God. It has led mankind away from that teaching which persists with the persistence of the Jew. The Jew who reads the Gospels should read them from a Jewish point of view. Mr. Montefiore's compilation of non-Jewish commentators cannot help him in this; nor can it help us to reach the true starting-point of Christianity, which lies in Jewish teaching. From that starting-point Christianity has followed one road, and Judaism another. The man of "the cross bench cast of mind" walks ill at ease on either. The Jew and Christian will go their separate ways, refreshed by the fruits that grow on each, and sustained by the faith that God in His own good time will bring all to a common meeting-ground.

Gerald Friedlander.

Spinoza, His Life and Treatise on God and Man. Translated, with Introduction and Commentary, by A. Wolf, M.A., D.LIT. A. and C. Black, 1910.

JEWISH interest in Spinoza—apart from the general interest of inquiring minds—arises from two sources: first, from his conflict with the authorities of the Amsterdam Synagogue; secondly, from his affinities, philosophical and theological, to previous Jewish writers, notably Maimonides and Ibn Ezra. Any book dealing with these two matters has claims on the attention of Jewish readers, especially if the writer is himself a Jew. Dr. Wolf, it is true, in editing and translating the *Korte Verhandeling* of Spinoza, writes primarily as a teacher of philosophy, and makes no specific appeal to Jewish readers. Yet he has so treated his subject as to say not a little about the two points connected with Spinoza which are of specifically Jewish interest, and to bring them into the greatest possible relief consistent with the plan of his book. Of the merits of this book as a contribution to the general literature of philosophy, or to the elucidation of Spinoza's system, we shall not here speak, but shall briefly review it in so far as, dealing with the Jewish elements in Spinoza's life and writings, it merits more particularly the attention of the Jewish student and general reader.

In the popular conception Spinoza figures vaguely either as a "God-intoxicated saint" and victim of religious bigotry, or else as an heretical free-thinker and underminer of religion. Dr. Wolf, in his "Introduction" of some hundred pages, gives a very readable life of Spinoza, which shows clearly how the truth lies midway between these conceptions, and how the gulf between him and his Jewish contemporaries, though wide enough, was not so terrible as is popularly imagined. Though a warm admirer of his author, Dr. Wolf as a biographer is commendably impartial, and tries to reach the point of view of both parties. After reading his account we have no difficulty in understanding both how a Spinoza could arise, and how his excommunication could take place, in the Amsterdam of the seventeenth century.

"I have also utilised," he says in his Preface, "to a greater extent than has been done hitherto all that is known of contemporary Jewish history and Jewish life, and have devoted more attention to Manasseh ben Israel than he has so far received in this connection." This is what was still required in the matter of Spinoza's biography, and the task could not have fallen to more competent hands than those of Dr. Wolf. What he here says of the home and school life of Spinoza and of the character of Manasseh ben Israel is highly interesting and suggestive. We should have been glad at the same time to learn a little more about the Rabbis, and—still more important—about the *Parnassim* who were responsible for Spinoza's excommunication; but probably there are no records left which could throw light on their characters and motives as individuals. It is reasonable, however, to presume in them a fair measure of enlightenment and broadmindedness, such as had been current in their community since its inception. They were not likely to proceed to such an extreme step as excommunication without very strong provocation, much stronger than was provided by the still somewhat vague heresies of the youthful Spinoza.

How, then, are we to account for the terrible anathema which they at length laid upon him? Dr. Wolf seems to us to have given the true solution of this difficulty by pointing to the intolerance of the Calvinist clergy in Holland at that time. Spinoza's heresies were likely to be not less dangerous to the Church than to the Synagogue, and on this account the Synagogue authorities thought it necessary to dissociate themselves from him in the most public and decisive manner possible. The position of the Jews in Holland was still very precarious, and might have been seriously compromised had one of their number produced a work either in Dutch or Latin which would have appeared heretical to the clergymen of Holland. Hence the community took what was probably on the whole the most prudent—though not a very courageous—course in ejecting Spinoza from their midst, before he had brought them into evil odour with their surroundings. As Dr. Wolf says, "If Judaism alone had been concerned, more leniency would have been shown, the whole thing might have been ignored. . . . The ban against Spinoza was the due paid to Cæsar, rather than to the God of Israel." We may, in fact, acquit the Amsterdam congregation of intolerance, at the cost of imputing to it a certain measure of cowardice.

With regard to Spinoza's Jewish affinities in thought, Dr. Wolf has in this book a little to say which is rather more interesting than satisfying. He shows us, in the Introduction, how Spinoza's early doubts and heresies may well have been due to the Hebrew reading which formed the staple of his education—to the works of Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, and Gersonides. Unfortunately, however, it lay out of the scope of this edition to show how these early Jewish ideas of Spinoza were afterwards embedded in his complete system of philosophy, and interwoven with those trains of thought which were suggested to him by Descartes. The frequent quotations from Maimonides in the notes serve only to elucidate the particular passages in the " Short Treatise " to which they are attached, and hardly enable the student to distinguish what is Jewish from what is non-Jewish in the book.

The only criticism we would offer is that, in his references to the Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages, Dr. Wolf does not allow for what may be called the elasticity of Jewish ceremonial in their day, as compared with the stereotyped form it had assumed in the time of Spinoza. " Orthodoxy " was as yet by no means the terror to inquiring minds that it afterwards became; and the Synagogue did not dominate the communal life in Cordova as it did in Amsterdam. " Spinoza," says Dr. Wolf, " lacked the power (one is almost inclined to call it a gift) which his Jewish predecessors possessed, namely, the power of detaching their theories from their practical everyday life. However advanced or heterodox their views may have been, yet they were conservative in feeling and conservative in practice, and observed religious customs just like the most orthodox." If Dr. Wolf will examine more carefully the relation of the practice of these philosophers to their theory, we think he will find reason to modify this statement considerably. They knew they were not infallible, and that there was much in the Talmudical literature which they did not properly understand; and when we take away their *mistakes* (as pointed out by, say, Nachmanides), we shall probably find that their " heterodoxy " shrinks to very small proportions; while, on the other hand, their practice, if judged by the standard of the *Shulchan Aruch*, might, perhaps, have left a little to be desired.

The *Short Treatise* is interesting chiefly as being a first sketch of the *Ethics*; and we should like to regard this edition as a sort of preliminary trial to a more important work which we hope to see Dr. Wolf some day undertake—an edition of the *Ethics*, in which he will allow himself a freer hand, and discuss more fully the philosophical equipment of Spinoza, including his affinities to the Jewish philosophers, of whom he is in many respects the spiritual heir.

M. SIMON.

Die Aufgaben der Sozial Politik in der Bukowina, mit besonderer Beleuchtung der Juden- und Bauernfrage. Von Prof. Dr. Eugen Ehrlich. Czernowitz, 1909; 40 heller.

THIS little pamphlet of thirty-one pages is full of material which is most interesting to all concerned with political economy, and particularly to Jews. It is interesting because it is capable of almost universal application. Although in Bukowina Jewish problems are greater and more pressing than in Western Europe, yet in character they are essentially identical and amenable to the same methods of relief. It is more particularly interesting to Jews because, coming from the pen of a competent outsider, it gives us an impartial estimate of our position, duties, and rights, and it further gives us sound practical advice for the amelioration of that position, the fulfilment of those duties and the safeguarding of those rights. Dr. Ehrlich opens with a statement of the economic outlook in Bukowina, which is somewhat depressing. He first repudiates any connection with those who seek social improvements by political methods. They split their forces by mutual opposition, and even if united, can achieve no good. The abnormal poverty of the country precludes the introduction of those methods of reform which have been so beneficial to other parts of the Austrian Empire. Protective tariffs, even if themselves of use, are thrown away here, for the peasant has nothing to protect. Old age pensions are useless because the peasant cannot pay the small annual contribution. The future of Bukowina depends on the encouragement of the small landowner, educating him and assisting his development, and in the solution of the Jewish question.

In dealing with this problem Dr. Ehrlich declares himself, personally, neither anti- nor philo-Semitic, but at the same time he sternly reprobates the baneful influence of anti-Semitism. He advocates a social and industrial assimilation of the Jews to the population of the countries where they are settled. This process will be mutually advantageous, and will be a powerful element in the great Pan-German scheme, which has been seriously affected by the mischief of anti-Semitism. "Whoever has at heart the interests of the German people in Austria, and the status of the German race among the nations, can only regret this. I think that this stupid students' sport, anti-Semitism, has played here a fateful historical rôle, that it has deprived the Germans of a sphere of power, or at least of influence, which might have extended from Bohemia to Odessa.

. . . A people with political understanding should have known how to secure to itself such advantages. The history, one day to be written, of Austria's ceasing to be a German state, an advanced post of German culture in the East, will have to devote a long chapter to German anti-Semitism."

Dealing with the present situation, Dr. Ehrlich points out that the Jews of Eastern Europe differ in many physiological points from their Western brethren; their conditions and their problems are vastly different, but their wretched state in the East produces a natural reaction in the West. Dr. Ehrlich exposes the fallacy that Jews are persecuted because of their wealth. Their poverty is overwhelming. Nor are they persecuted on account of their criminal propensities, for they are below the average in this respect. The 100,000 Jews in Bukowina are not all usurers or bar-keepers; and the percentage flocking to the universities is steadily producing a learned proletariat. The majority of Jews are intermediaries in the corn and cattle trades. Hence arises the problem. The plans for the elevation of the peasantry will, if successful, result in the formation of unions, on the Danish system, which will do away with the *raison d'être* of these Jewish agents. Every step in the direction of progress must be taken at the cost of Jewish prosperity. Dr. Ehrlich frankly recognises and deplores this; he next asks what is to be the future of these people? He turns first to Zionism and colonisation—to which his objections are twofold. He objects because the institution of a Jewish nationality means a loss to German nationality, and because it will take away the better classes and leave the physically and morally inferior behind. Zionism is of no benefit to the lands wherein the Jews are, and of little benefit to the Jews, since it will only affect so small a proportion of them. The salvation of peasants and Jews alike will, he holds, be the introduction of industries and manufactures, which will develop the natural resources of land and people and create a new artisan class, which ought to form one of the staple wage-earning sections in every well-organised community. In capitalism and craftsmanship there is ample room and opportunity for the Jews to play a prominent part and assist in the regeneration of themselves and fellow-citizens. To illustrate this Dr. Ehrlich draws a picture of Whitechapel before and after the influence of the Jews had been felt there. It is to the industry of the Jews that the economic success of Whitechapel is due.

That there is ample food for consideration and discussion will be seen from the foregoing outline, and Dr. Ehrlich's arguments for the economic utility of the Jews may be recommended to all those who are fighting the battle of the Aliens Bill.

HERBERT LOEWE.

Books received, of which a review will appear later :—

Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. By S. Schechter, M.A., LITT.D. pp. xxii–384. London : Adam & Charles Black, 1909.

The Law and the Prophets; or, The Revelation of Jehovah in Hebrew History from the earliest times to the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Being the work entitled *Jéhovah*, by Professor Westphal, of Montaban. Translated and adapted by Clement Du Pontet, M.A. pp. xxviii–457. London : Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1910.

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law. pp. xii–239. London : Elliot Stock, 1910.

The Quest of the Historical Jesus. By Albert Schweitzer, Privat-dozent in the University of Strasburg. Translated by W. Montgomery, B.A., B.D.

Cambridge Biblical Essays. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. pp. 556. Macmillan & Co., 1909. 12s. net.

Early Church History to A.D. 313. By Henry Melvill Gwatkin, Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History. 2 vols. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1909. 17s. net.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden, Tiel I *: Zur Geschichte der Juden im Vierten Jahrhundert.* Von Rabbiner Dr. Leopold Lucas. Berlin : Mayer & Müller.

THE JEWISH REVIEW

DITED BY
ORMAN BENTWICH
AND
DR JOSEPH HOCHMA

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes: King Edward VII. The Jewish Problem. Abraham Geiger. Jews' College and Anglo-Jewry. The International Jewish Conference in London. The Resignation of Dr. Magnes. PAGE 95

The Jewish Doctrine of Atonement. *The Very Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler* 117

England and the Jewish Land Question. *Davis Trietsch, Berlin* 125

Græco-Roman Criticism of Some Jewish Observances and Beliefs (concluded) . *Dr. A. Büchler* 131

The Birth of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. *M. Liber, Paris* 146

The History of the Prayer-book. *Herbert M. Adler* 156

The Talmud Student: A Poem. *Miss Helena Frank* 164

A Study in Liturgical Poetry . . *A. Mishcon* 173

Reviews of Books: Cambridge Biblical Essays. The Samaritan Liturgy. Philo-Judæus of Alexandria, etc. 176

Vol. I. No. 2. July, 1910 PRICE 1/6 NET.

ONDON:—GEO. ROUTLEDGE & SONS LD.

NEW YORK: THE BLOCH PUBLISHING CO.

Aspects of the Hebrew Genius.

Crown 8vo, Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

THE UNION OF JEWISH LITERARY SOCIETIES has much pleasure in bringing to your notice a new work entitled "ASPECTS OF THE HEBREW GENIUS," which has just been published for them. This volume consists of a series of Essays dealing with Jewish thought during the last two thousand years, viz.:—

1. **PHILO.** By NORMAN BENTWICH.
2. **SAADIAH.** By M. SIMON.
3. **MAIMONIDES.** By Rev. H. S. LEWIS.
4. **JEWISH CODES & CODIFIERS.** By Dr. S. DAICHES.
5. **ARISTOTLE & MEDIÆVAL JEWISH THOUGHT.** By Dr. A. WOLF.
6. **JEWISH MYSTICISM.** By H. SPERLING.
7. **THE JEWISH NEW LEARNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** By M. H. SEGAL.

The Introduction, by Mr. ELKAN N. ADLER, *President of the Union of Jewish Literary Societies*, forms a connecting link between the several Essays, and gives unity to the volume.

FOR HIGH CLASS

TYPEWRITING

MSS., Plays, Specifications,
Legal Copying, Correspondence,
etc. etc.

Shorthand, Duplicating, & Circularising

TRY

MISS COLEMAN,

SOLICITORS' AND GENERAL TYPEWRITING CO.,
68B Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.
Telephone: 3009 Holborn. *4 doors from Kingsway.*

The Jewish Review

SIVAN 5670. VOL. I. No. 2. JULY 1910

EDITORIAL NOTES

King Edward VII

IT is related by Suetonius that when Julius Cæsar was murdered, the Jews in Rome offered up the bitterest lamentations of all his subjects and clung around his corpse; they knew that they had lost not only a great ruler, but also a great friend. So to-day the Jews in the British Empire mourn the death of King Edward with perhaps greater poignancy than any other section of his subjects. They honoured him as a model constitutional sovereign and as a noble worker for their ideal of peace; and more than that, they loved him as the friend of their people not only in his own vast empire, but all the world over. Edward VII was preeminent above all his predecessors and all the crowned heads of his time not in tolerance—for tolerance is, after all, a negative attitude towards those who are regarded as inferiors—but in his absolute freedom from every taint of racial or religious prejudice. The direct power of an English king in the legislation of his country is to-day very small, but his influence upon its social life is the greater; and that influence was used by Edward VII throughout his life for the breaking down of aristocratic narrowness and the recognition of merit. During his reign the Anglo-Jewish community celebrated the jubilee of its political emancipation; and it was a striking symbol of the completeness of their victory in the struggle for civic rights, that a Jewish member of the Cabinet took part in the celebration, and that subsequently two other Jewish ministers were appointed in the present Government. Still more striking is the contrast afforded between the position of the Jews in the reigns of the first and seventh Edwards. In the thirteenth century "the King's Jews," as they were called, were part of the royal chattels, not only lacking the rights of citizens, but outside the protection of the law, and secured only by the sovereign's need for money. They were the whetstones upon which the weapons of the young Parliament were sharpened, and when the prelates and nobles demanded their expulsion, they were sacrificed and abandoned by their royal owner. To-day English Jews not only enjoy the fullest civic rights, but they play a large part in the Government of the empire and take a prominent place in the making and administration of its laws. Their social position does not depend upon the goodwill of the King, but it has received an added dignity from his friendship; and England has become the example to all Jewish communities of the fullness of emancipation. The generous feelings of the English King make it the bitterer reflection that in his reign an Act should have been entered upon the Statute-book, which takes away the asylum of these shores from many of our brethren who are fleeing from lands where they live under conditions as bad as existed here in the time of Edward I. On the other hand, we cannot forget that in the reign of King Edward the English Government gave official recognition to the Jewish nationality. The offer to the Jewish people of a territory in East Africa as a refuge for the persecuted of Eastern Europe, though it could be no solution of the Jewish problem, marked a new epoch and aroused a new hope. England, which in the reign of Victoria had assisted the downtrodden people of Italy, in the reign of her son showed a willingness to stretch out a helping hand to the downtrodden people of Israel. The truest respect which the English Jews can pay to the memory of their late King is in earnest and unremitting efforts to secure for their kindred in less happy lands the blessings of full liberty which they enjoy; what he and his ministers with a broad humanitarian aim strove to do for the oppressed of a foreign country, surely we are called upon to do on behalf of our kith and kin; and by so doing we shall most completely carry out the English ideals of equal justice and large humanity, of which King Edward was not only the titular, but the real representative.

The Jewish Problem

For centuries the world has been possessed by the problem of the survival of the Jew—*Das ewig Jüdische*—and has not yet found a solution for it. Some writers are angered by this obstinate persistence of a small minority in every part of the globe, and their anger finds vent in anti-Semitic agitation. Others are struck by admiration, and strive to convince their countrymen that the Jews would be like everybody else if only they were left alone; others, again, are simply nonplussed by it, and know not whether to admire or to grieve. Of these is Mr. G. F. Abbott, the author of *Israel in Europe*, who has recently been writing upon "The Jewish Problem" in the *Fortnightly Review*. He pictures the wretched condition of the masses of the Jewish people to-day, and conceives that there are only two possible solutions of the trouble: either the removal of Gentile prejudice by the complete assimilation of the Jew to his environment, or the avoidance of persecution by complete separation of the Jew from the Gentile in a territory of his own. Sceptical of the second solution, he is thrown back upon assimilation as the one way out: the Jew, as the weaker minority, must yield to the stronger surrounding majority. He admits the sadness of the end, but he can see no other. Sadder still, Mr. Zangwill, writing in the same Review, is not much more hopeful of the future of his people. "Ichabod" is the burden of the former Dreamer of the Ghetto. Palestinian Zionism is bankrupt, and Territorialism outside Palestine "cannot hope to focus all Jewish forces in one great effort." It remains, then, only for the Jews to seek peaceful citizenship as a religious minority and become "more American than the Americans." Mr. Zangwill has planted his tree on a barren soil, and now its fruit, like the apple of the Dead Sea, turns in his hand to dust and ashes.

We cannot accept the conclusions either of the non-Jewish or the Jewish critic. Judaism has a soul which cannot be killed by assimilation, and the Jewish people have a longing for Palestine which cannot be crushed by the alleged impossibility of the country for settlement. The Jewish problem is not new, nor can it be solved of a sudden. Ever since the dispersion began, i.e. from the time of the Babylonian Captivity, the Jewish population has aroused the envy and enmity of its Gentile neighbours. In the Græco-Roman period their offence is that they are nationalists in a cosmopolitan society; in the Dark and the Middle Ages, that they are heretics and infidels in a Christian society; to-day, that they are cosmopolitans in a national society. But beneath the specific complaint the fundamental ground of dislike is that they are different, refusing to be absorbed like other minorities, and keeping themselves racially, as well as religiously, separate. The Jews, on the other hand, have been proud of their differences, conscious of a peculiar spiritual heritage and historic culture, and looking forward full of hope to the realisation of their ideal, the coming of the age of righteousness and justice, with which shall be associated their national restoration. "Persecution," said the Rabbis, "befitteth Israel as a red cord befits an ox"; and the attacks of their opponents have but invigorated the Jewish spirit and confirmed the strength of the people. Thus it is in Eastern Europe to-day that Jewish consciousness attains its greatest intensity and its finest expression; and in the West that the Jew touches the lowest depths of a soulless materialism.

The Jews are threatened rather by the dangers of peace than by the dangers of struggle. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, when men were under the influences of the generous ideas of the French Revolution, they hoped that a new era was beginning when all racial, national, and religious hatreds would be buried, and every individual judged according to his worth. In the flush of that hope the Jew claimed and won his citizenship in the countries of Western Europe; and he proceeded to throw off much of the separateness which had been thrust upon him. In the transformation he lost his peculiar character, and manifested in the place of the old idealism a triumphant materialism which roused a new hostility and a new dread. The history of the last forty years, too, has shown that, while he was willing to relinquish the greater part of his special outlook, the nations were not willing to receive him as an equal unless he gave up his racial separateness; he was anxious to be assimilated, but they required absorption. Though he had lost much of his old pride and historic consciousness, he shrunk from that last step; and they therefore denied him full scope for the exercise of his faculties, and built up a new social Ghetto more galling than the cramped physical home of his ancestors. Yet are we not so pessimistic as Mr. Abbott or Mr. Zangwill about the future of the Jewish people. The ideas of the French Revolution have not, it is true, been fully realised, but they have left their permanent impress upon our civilisation, and though here and there reaction will assert itself, the forces of humanity must progress; and even in Eastern Europe the time will come when the Jews will enjoy the rights of man. Judaism, again, as we believe, will succumb neither to the blandishments of assimilation nor the rigours of persecution. In the future, as in the past, it may be saved by a minority of the Jews; but there are signs on many sides of a Jewish awakening. Over against that centrifugal melting process, which Mr. Zangwill has eloquently described, we may set the revival of Jewish consciousness in the lands of emancipation. The Zionist movement, above all, marks the new activity of the Jewish spirit. Though some of its first advocates were prone to represent it as a political solution for the Jewish question, it was and is in essence the striving for a full and free development of Jewish nationality and Jewish religion. While the great Beth-Din endured, said Maimonides, there was no dissension in Israel. Religious disintegration is the inevitable outcome of the lack of a Jewish centre, which can be established only in the land where Judaism grew up, and to which the aspirations of the people have turned for three thousand years. A spiritual centre in Palestine is the necessary complement of a free Jewish life in the Diaspora, necessary to give it a standard of religion and to preserve intact its Jewish outlook. Without it Judaism is like to be a decaying and impotent creed; with it Judaism may become, as it was before the downfall of the nation, a supreme influence upon the world's civilisation.

As we read the Jewish position to-day, the problem is how the Jews, dispersed over the world and living amid an environment with diverse manners and cultures, may, while enjoying the fruits of emancipation, yet retain their special outlook and preserve their unity; and the answer to that problem is that, following their historic ideal, they must in every country demand and foster a higher conception of national life than at present exists, in which not uniformity of character, but the combination of different nationalities in one harmonious state, will be recognised as the condition of progress; and, further, they must build up a home in their ancient land wherein they will so develop their historic culture as to make their social life and their spiritual teaching an example to mankind, and at the same time give to the scattered parts of their people a renewed pride in their nationality and their religion, and fit them for the mission which to-day they but feebly carry out, but for which they have been preserved through the ages of suffering and martyrdom.

Abraham Geiger, 1810–74

The centenary of the birth of Abraham Geiger, which was celebrated on May 24th, recalls the beginnings of the struggles for Political Emancipation and Religious Reform. The movements that resulted gave an impulse to the direction of Jewish life and thought in the western world from which it has but recently begun to recover. In this period of recovery, and at this distance of time, it becomes more possible to estimate the influence that Geiger exercised, and to reconsider the justice of the summary manner in which Graetz through his *History of the Jews*, has accustomed us to dismiss his work. The activity of the early generation of Jewish Reformers in Germany is closely intertwined with the struggle for Political Emancipation, in which Geiger also played his part. The Jews of France had satisfied Napoleon that they were not, to use his own phrase, *une nation dans la nation.* That denial, which was the keynote of the answers to the questions which Napoleon asked of the Synhedrion he summoned, became the watchword of Jewish Reformers. It was, however, in the more numerous German Jewry, intellectually stimulated as it was by closer contact with the Jewries of Poland, Hungary, and Italy, that the change in outward conditions produced organised efforts to bring about a corresponding reinterpretation of Judaism.

It is sometimes maintained that there can be no

Jewish history of modern times; but only histories of Jews in many lands, and that such histories are but part of the stories of those lands. This attitude was characteristic of the early Jewish Reformers, and were it possible to think of Jews and Judaism as factors apart, Jewish history of modern times might indeed resolve itself into isolated chapters, that would each end with the achievement of Political Emancipation. At first it did indeed seem as if the work of Jewish Reformers would be limited in its effects to the land of its origin; but the leaders were conscious that their work, to be effective, could not be so confined, and Geiger gave expression to that consciousness in his proposal to include other than German Rabbis in the Rabbinical Conferences in Germany. His historic sense thus led Geiger the scholar to proclaim that unity of the house of Israel which the political ideas of his day induced him to deny: and in these conflicting influences on his thought we may find the explanations of seeming contradictions in his work, which lend some colour to Graetz's harsh judgment of him as vacillating and easily led. Geiger placed in the forefront of his plan for reform in ritual the elimination of all distinctive national aspirations, and the substitution of the "mother tongue" for the Hebrew, which was to be rejected because a separate tongue was a mark of separate nationality. He argued as a scholar and had the support of Rabbis of conservative tendencies for the omission of sacrificial references from the prayer-book, and the Triennial cycle of Sedrahs; while the influence of contemporary political struggles appears throughout his contentions for the other lines of his programme.

On the other hand, the scholarship which made him keenly conscious of the unity and continuity of Judaism induced his opposition to the extreme proposals of the Frankfort Friends of Reform. It led him also to refuse the "call" of the Berlin Reform Congregation, on the ground that he had rather be head of a united congregation, with all its dissensions, than take the lead in sectarian segregation. The influence of contemporary political ideas, divorced from his historic sense and scholarship, led his associates to extremes from which he shrank.

Narrow as the education of former Rabbis may have been, scholarship in his field of learning was the Rabbi's prime qualification for office and authority. Had it remained so, Jewish Reform would, perhaps, have been saved the odium which has attached to it. Geiger, who recognised that the work of Rabbis could no longer be adequately fulfilled by mere casuistic ability in matters of *dîn*, recognised also that the changed conditions must do no more than modify the range of studies, but could not entail a change in the character of the Rabbinic office. His attitude in this respect brought about the bitter struggles that marked the early years of his tenure of office at Breslau, where his colleague, a Rabbi of the old school, insisted that the legal functions of a Rabbi could not be exercised by a man of modern leanings. At that time the offices of preacher and Rabbi were in many congregations held by separate persons; but Geiger refused to recognise the partition in Judaism which the separation symbolised. He gained the day, and his victory has had its permanent result in the growing tendency to maintain the combination of these offices.

Geiger, to further his ideal of the Rabbi, began early to plead for the foundation of a Jewish Theological Faculty at the Universities. While still a student at the University of Bonn, he had founded a Homiletical Society in conjunction with Samson Raphael Hirsch, afterwards his strenuous orthodox opponent, and other Jewish students. With reference to this he wrote, as early as 1832: "We have formed a society of seven members. . . . We are without any inspiring example or master's help. . . . If only a Jewish Seminary could be founded at a

University, where Exegesis, Homiletics, Talmud, and Jewish history could be taught in true Jewish spirit!" He was thus the first among modern Jewish theologians to advocate the institution of a Jewish Theological Faculty; and though the University authorities proved obdurate, and after nearly eight decades his aspiration still remains an ideal awaiting realisation, his ideas fructified in the foundation of independent Seminaries.

In 1835, while Rabbi at Wiesbaden, he established his critical magazine, whereby he hoped to help in giving to Judaism the scientific foundation which was needed as a preliminary to purposive reform. He, however, consistently maintained that while the Rabbi should be free to publish his critical researches, he had no right to translate them into practice without the support of an authorised body. In harmony with this view, and while still at Wiesbaden, he issued a call for a Rabbinical Conference to exercise such authority. It was the first call of its kind, and was destined to create a new power in Jewry. At the second meeting of the Conference of Rabbis in Germany, Geiger was appointed on a commission to interest the public in the cause of the foundation of Jewish Theological Faculties in Germany, and he was instrumental in securing the legacy of J. Fränkel for the foundation of the Rabbinical Seminary in Breslau. Thus the organised efforts which resulted in the reinterpretation of Judaism that so powerfully affects our modern life, were in large measure due to the activities in which Abraham Geiger expressed his peculiar views; and whatever be the school of Jewish thought to which we belong, we cannot withhold the acknowledgment of our indebtedness for two results of his life's work, the Rabbinical Conferences and the Theological Seminaries, which assert themselves ever more powerfully in modern Jewish religious activities.

Geiger's activity then was characterised by a consistent advocacy of unity, which, while raising him above parties, brought down the attacks of extremists upon him. His scholarship lent weight to his utterances, and if the rapidity of his researches left loopholes for criticism and the lapse of time has antiquated his results, his studies included epoch-making works in Jewish science and destroyed many prejudices. The influence of his public activities is felt far beyond their original sphere, and his two lasting legacies may yet become our stepping-stones to higher things. The foundation of Jewish Theological Faculties at our Universities would do much to raise the professional standing of the Jewish ministry, and could the Rabbinical Conferences be converted into a really authoritative international gathering of Rabbis of all communities in sympathy with Rabbinism, would not a need of our day be met thereby ? It was in such meetings of Rabbis that our body of traditional laws originated. In the Diaspora the possibilities of such gatherings have never been greater than they are now, through our modern means of communication. The associations of earlier and present Rabbinic Conferences with anti-Rabbinism can hardly be sufficient justification for abstention on the part of those Jewish leaders, who are anxious for Jewish observance, from conferring on the problems that must be anticipated to be effectively dealt with, and on the work they now do in isolation. We have outgrown the fear of asserting the unity of the house of Israel, and stand not a little in need of the Geiger among observant Jews to call into being the conference that would fortify Jewish observance, without denying Jewish aspirations. What a Herzl rendered possible to Zionists for political activities should one day be rendered possible by an observant Geiger for our religious interests. In these things Geiger still stands above parties to point us our way.

Jews' College and Anglo-Jewry

THE Bishop of Kensington, in moving a resolution which was carried unanimously at the recent London Diocesan Conference, complained that the spiritual weakness manifest in all classes of society demanded serious attention, and called upon the laity to relieve the clergy of duties which hinder the higher purpose of their ministry. These remarks apply with almost equal validity to the Anglo-Jewish community. The Jewish population of the United Kingdom is about 240,500. The proportion of members on the rolls of synagogue registers is only about one-tenth, and in London alone some 15,000 children are without any provision for religious education. These figures indicate the wide field that lies before the organiser who would devote himself to the religious interests of Anglo-Jewry. If it be true that any country has the Jews it deserves, it is no less true that every Jewry has the leaders it deserves. Under governments wise enough to give free play to the forces of idealism pent up in the Jewish people, they have surprised mankind with a continued ability to produce men of genius as leaders in social progress; and in a free environment those forces have worked through men gifted with the genius for religion, producing a succession of teachers to replenish the people with the spirit of Judaism. Religious leadership and political influence were the twin products of the freedom which Jews enjoyed under the favourable governments of the Persians and Parthians, the Ptolemies and the Caliphate. Our people can boast once more of Jewish leaders in the parliaments of modern nations, and Jewish ministers in the governments of our day; and where Jews are present in large numbers in an atmosphere of enlightenment and freedom, religious teachers have arisen whose influence has been, and must continue to be, far-reaching, whether in direct or indirect effects, whether in the movements they create or the opposition they call forth. Anglo-Jewry, if less numerous than the Jewries of Germany and the United States, has none the less reached respectable proportions, and is in any case admittedly the most influential of all Jewries. We however have failed to produce a Zunz among our scholars or a Geiger among our Reformers, or a Samson Raphael Hirsch among the observant members of our community, to overcome the indifference that the condition of our religious organisation so painfully betrays. The hour cries for the man, but no man appears, because the religious life of Anglo-Jewry centres not around the vitalising forces of personal powers, but around the inert mechanism of an official organisation, secured by its power to compel those desirous of Jewish burial to become members of its synagogues. Yet the United Synagogue is evidence of the material prosperity of the organisation in the midst of the spiritual poverty of the community, for after defraying its ordinary expenses it can spend £4500 annually on extraneous objects. But we can hardly regard this prosperity in any other way than as a dangerous soporific, in view of the painfully obvious "underlapping," to use a word the Chief Rabbi so happily coined in another connection.

The religious organisation that is independent of religious personality is dangerous. It proclaims the victory of a church over a religion, the victory that makes of the church a tomb and the religion an heirloom. That is the danger with which the Jews are now face to face in England. So much so is this the case that the Rabbinical seminary, which has been recognised in every land of the Western world as a primary need of modern Jewry, is only beginning painfully to struggle into existence in our midst. Let us hope we are not mistaken in regarding this struggle as a sign of our awakening to the danger of our position. It is true we have our Jews' College, but the condition of that institution reflects the absence of religious interest in Anglo-Jewry no less truly than does the attitude of the community towards it. Although it places the training of Rabbis in the forefront of its programme, until quite recent times no provision was made to that end, and no Rabbis graduated in England. Up to the present only five persons have received the Rabbinical diploma —only one before leaving the College—and no minister exercises Rabbinical functions in his congregation. What wonder that the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, in enumerating existing Rabbinical seminaries (see article "Rabbi"), makes no mention of our Jews' College! While we rest content with synagogue officials and charity visitors as our spiritual guides, and the ministers who issue from the college are officially denied the recognition of their distinctive office, our community will have its preachers and readers, but will continue to look in vain for the Rabbi-preachers and religious leaders who elsewhere kindle religious zeal. For Jews' College cannot be expected to arouse in its students a zeal for work for which the community consistently denies opportunity. The United Synagogue recently appointed a Committee of Inquiry to consider its grant to Jews' College, which, with a contrariness that would be amusing if it were not mischievous, decried the attention to Jewish scholarship by candidates for the ministry. Like the people in *Hudibras*, they

> Compound for sins they are inclined to,
> By damning those they have no mind to.

While the College, under its principal Dr. Büchler, is struggling to raise the standard of the Jewish ministry, the report of that Committee revealed a determination to depress it. We welcome Dr. Büchler's outspoken reply to the critics at the recent Distribution of Prizes; but we note with extreme regret that the authorities of the College were unable to insist on a free hand in the arrangement of its curriculum. We cannot refrain from quoting the comment of a foreign paper on the Committee's report, which revealed the ideal minister that the United Synagogue pictures: "The idea that the spiritual leaders of the community must possess a deep and profound scholarship coupled with general culture appears to find as little place in their minds as that the Jewish *Gemilluth Chesed* is the natural requisite for a Rabbi." Yet the College authorities humbly declare to the Council of the United Synagogue that they have taught and will teach their students Hazanuth, while they can find no room in their curriculum for courses in Jewish philosophy, and leave preparation for the Rabbinical diploma to their past students. What Rabbinical seminary imposes Hazanuth on candidates for Rabbinical office? What Rabbinical seminary is taxed with the cost in money and energy of preparing students within its walls for University examinations? But, despite these extra burdens, the scant recognition which the College receives from the community leaves it to make bricks without straw. While the Jewish Theological Seminary of America can boast of an endowment of some 500,000 dollars,—and that though American Jewry supports another seminary in Cincinatti,—while Continental seminaries are supported by organisations specially formed for the purpose, and the Lehranstalt has had cause to thank the Berlin community in its last Report for increasing its grant from 8000 to 12,000 marks per annum, our United Synagogue grudgingly grants to Jews' College to-day the £200 it granted over thirty years ago. And be it remembered that, besides the Lehranstalt, the ultra-orthodox section of Berlin Jewry maintains a world-famed seminary of its own, whose alumni are among the teachers of the Jewish Theological Seminaries at Berlin, London, and New York. When we remember how the wealth of London Jewry exceeds that of Berlin, that the Jewish population of

London is half as large again as that of Berlin, and that the Berlin community draws an incomparably smaller proportion of its ministers from the Lehranstalt than does the United Synagogue from Jews' College, we shall perhaps realise how sadly Anglo-Jewry proclaims its religious indifference to the world by its treatment of Jews' College.

Anglo-Jewry cannot continue for ever to rest content with an unqualified ministry. As it grows in numbers it calls for the services of men of large ability, who can be won by the offer of a sufficient sphere of activity and corresponding responsibility. We shall need men with the higher qualifications with which the College now seeks to equip its students, and our community will fail in its primary duty to the rising generation of Jews in England, if it does not secure to Jews' College the means wherewith to rise to the needs of our changing circumstances and adjust its organisation to meet them. It is not generally known that the long-cherished ideal of a Faculty of Jewish Theology at a University was almost within our reach at the time when the University of London was reorganised as a teaching University. An oversight was responsible for the loss of the opportunity of enabling the students of Jews' College to take their degrees in Divinity. Had the authorities of the College been less troubled with the difficulty of meeting an annual deficit of £500 and free to fulfil their educational responsibilities, the status both of Jews' College and the Anglo-Jewish Ministry would at once have been raised. Jews' College is the barometer of the value of our religious professions. It behoves Anglo-Jewry to help it rise.

The International Jewish Conference in London

There may be some doubt as to the expediency of holding a special Jewish conference upon the subject of the White Slave Traffic, more especially as, immediately after the Jewish gathering in London had dispersed, an international congress of representatives of the Powers assembled at Paris, to consider what legislative steps could be taken to remove the nauseating blot upon our civilisation. The Jewish delegates, it may be urged, could recommend no effective measures against the men who carry on the trade, and who can be deterred only by the penal law. Resolutions to exclude them from Jewish society have no terrors for them, and beyond this the conference could not go. On the other hand, the publicity given to the proceedings may lend colour to an unwelcome and, as we believe, an unfounded idea that the White Slave Traffic is peculiarly a Jewish trade. That notion is certainly one of the stock weapons in the armoury of the anti-Semite; but wherever the charge has been investigated, as was recently done in New York, it has been entirely disproved. Nevertheless, the congress is a welcome sign that the Jews of all parts recognise their common responsibility for the shame which is cast upon our people by the participation of Jews and Jewesses in this calling, and are determined to take common action in order to remove it. By their baser products, if by nothing else, Jews are forcibly reminded that they are one people. It is a melancholy reflection to consider that whereas the feeling of solidarity fifty years ago called forth movements among Western Jews to found schools for their less prosperous and less enlightened brethren in the East, it now impels them to discuss measures for dealing with the plague spots of Jewish degeneration. Everybody must realise that the traffic is not an isolated phenomenon nor a malady which can be cured by direct treatment. It is but the most ugly and hideous expression of the diseases which infest our outwardly high civilisation, while Jewish participation in it is only the most glaring mark of the degradation of our people. The direct cause is the miserable economic position of the lowest classes in the towns; and collective Jewish effort must be devoted to modify these conditions, so far as they affect their own people. When we remember that to the ordinary destitution of the proletariate there is added, in the case of the Eastern Jewish communities, a cruel and calculated persecution designed to crush both body and soul, it is not surprising that part of the supply of the traffic is found among the Jewish population. No proceedings against the evil can be effective which do not recognise its economic basis, and seek a remedy for it through the amelioration of economic conditions. By reducing, through organised emigration, and the provision of trade schools and technical schools, the congested areas of Galicia, Roumania, and Russia, the reservoirs of vice will be drained, if not dried up; for chastity has been a pre-eminent virtue of the Jewish people in the past; and it is the harshness of circumstance and the bitterness of her hard, cabined, and hopeless life which drive the Jewish girl to her fall. The traffic, then, is to be fought not at the ports of departure for emigrants nor at the big capitals of the West, but in the Ghettos of the East.

Yet economic misery is not the only cause of Jewish participation: our people have been as harshly persecuted and as cruelly downtrodden in former ages; but penury and misery never before drove them to vice, since they had a pride in themselves and a reverence for their law. To-day, however, moral degeneration accompanies economic destitution. "*Optimi corruptio* *pessima*"; and the freedman from the Ghetto who lacks that pride and that respect, and knows not the restraining force of public opinion, too often acquires and exaggerates the vices of the new society in which he finds himself, and becomes the minister of its basest desires. Jewish activity in the traffic is the extreme manifestation of the low morale which the rejection of Judaism involves for the half-educated, for whom religion and morality are inextricably combined. The shame of the race is the bitter harvest which we reap from the neglect of Jewish education. The extension and improvement of our schools may seem a far-fetched remedy for the glaring evil, but in the school, to our mind, lies the hope of reform. It is too late to cope with the man or the fallen victim, but the child must be so moulded as to render it impossible for it afterwards to lose human dignity and the strength of character which comes from religious influence. "Small remedies for great diseases," said John Stuart Mill, "do not produce small results; they produce no results." If the leaders of the Jewish communities are prepared to deal with the broad economic and moral causes which underlie the evil, the conference will have been productive of good; if, on the other hand, they are minded only to reform the methods of vigilance committees or distribute circulars to Rabbis, their work will be the merest tinkering and patching; and though it may salve their consciences, it will not help much to remove the reproach from their people or to free humanity from a loathsome plague spot.

The Resignation of Dr. Magnes

In our first number we published a striking address by the Rev. Dr. J. L. Magnes, of Temple Emanu-el, New York, on " A Reform of Judaism upon a Nationalist Basis," in which he pointed out the danger of " an ossified Reform and an illiberal Liberalism," and appealed for a return to Jewish tradition and the recognition of a Jewish nationality as the basis of a counter-reformation. On the first day of Passover Dr. Magnes delivered another sermon upon the same theme, and laid down more distinctly the lines upon which he proposed to bring about a genuine reform of Judaism " by a revivification of its true spirit and sacred traditions." He pleaded, among other changes, for the restoration of the Bar-Mitzvah ceremony for boys, for the study of the Hebrew language in the Temple religious school, for throwing wide open the gates of the Temple to the poorer Jewish population of New York, and for the partial substitution of the traditional Jewish prayer-book for the prayer-book of the Union of Hebrew congregations, which contains mainly prayers and hymns in English. His cry was " Back to the living waters of Judaism," not indeed to an inflexible orthodoxy, but to the traditions of the whole congregation of Israel, which have been the life of our people for centuries, which represent the expression of the Jewish spirit and the Jewish outlook on life, and which alone can preserve to-day the unity and the spiritual vitality of the scattered Jewish communities. On May 16th Dr. Magnes wrote to the Board of Trustees of Temple Emanu-el, declaring that unless the congregation could give some sign of agreement with his position, he could not be a candidate for re-election as Rabbi in their pulpit; and a week later, after the Board had reported itself unable to recommend his re-election, the members of the congregation at the annual meeting adopted their report. Dr. Magnes has struck a great blow not only for the recognition of the true function of the Rabbi, but also for catholic and progressive Judaism. The Trustees of Temple Emanu-el have, we feel sure, struck a fatal blow not only at the position of their own congregation in American Jewry, but at Reformed and disintegrated Judaism. Their action is perfectly logical, but its logic is deadening. They may argue that they have acted in accordance with the trust deed, and rid the congregation of dangerous and disturbing doctrines; but history has proved with other denominations that the religious leader who places conviction before office has prevailed; and religious well-being demands that a teacher should be free to speak, controlled only by the fear of God and not by the fear of man. It was time that a Jewish Rabbi arose to claim the rights of a religious leader of his congregation, and to dare what a Wesley and a Newman dared for his convictions.

The lay leaders of Jewish congregations, both in England and America, presume too far when they try to degrade the Rabbi to the "preacher of comfortable words," and to hedge in his exposition of Judaism by their own ignorance of its principles and its history. Whether, as in England, they require an adherence to a set form of belief which many of them do not hold, and to a form of ritual which many of them do not understand; or whether, as in America, they require the assertion of a conception of Judaism established by their grandfathers and the repudiation of older or newer conceptions, their interference and their dictation are equally impertinent and mischievous. What makes the resignation of Dr. Magnes the more striking is that its cause is his insistence on more Judaism and "a closer communion with the whole House of Israel." Rabbis have before been compelled to leave their congregations because they wanted to introduce innovations in the service, or because they have stood up against the will of many of the members for nationalist ideas; but this, we think, is the first time that one has given up his position because he wanted to strengthen the Jewish consciousness of his flock. Liberal Judaism has claimed to stand for a free pulpit; but the freedom, it seems, is to be only in the direction of breaking away from Judaism. In that way a leader may go as far as he likes, but if he would lead people back, and ask of them some real thought for their religion, freedom is denied. It is fitting that the demand for a counter-reformation, for a closer approach to the sources, of Judaism, should be associated with the demand for the recognition of the Rabbi as a spiritual leader. For the salvation and the revival of Judaism are bound up with the respect and reverence for its teachers, which their knowledge and their sincerity must command.

The Jewish Doctrine of Atonement

The volume of sermons, *Anglo-Jewish Memories*, recently published, contains a discourse on the Jewish doctrine of Atonement. As stated in the introduction, its purpose was to refute the sophistries argued in the tracts circulated by conversionists before the Day of Atonement with the object of shaking our faith in the efficacy of that great day. I proceeded to enunciate the Jewish doctrine of Atonement, that every man is accountable to God for his own actions, and cannot release himself from his individual responsibility by the intercession of another person, however great and estimable. We require no mediator to save us from the effect of our guilt. Our own sincere repentance and amendment suffice to obtain for us Divine forgiveness.

My enunciation of these principles has elicited some criticism on the part of Christian theologians and divines. Such criticisms I always hail with welcome. I only regret that the ever-increasing burden of official duties compels me to be brief in my rejoinder.

I would first refer to the volume on *The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation*, by the Rev. Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley (*London: Skeffington & Son*, 1910. *pp. viii*-239. 3*s.* 6*d. net*). We are grateful for every publication emanating from his pen, for, judging by the work written by him in collaboration with the Rev. J. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, we may be certain that his arguments are the outcome of sound research, and are entirely free from prejudice. The purpose of his treatise is to record some of the results of an investigation into what is to be gathered concerning the doctrine of mediation in Jewish literature, ancient and modern.

He admits (p. 2) that the idea of a mediator is very rarely to be discerned in the Old Testament, but claims that the principle of mediation underlies the entire conception of the relationship between God and His people. This assumption he bases upon an incident which, I claim, teaches the very opposite doctrine. It is related in the thirty-second chapter of Exodus that, when the wrath of the Almighty was kindled against Israel for having made and worshipped a golden idol, Moses is ready to sacrifice himself for the nation. He prays, "If Thou wilt forgive their sin—: and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written." I maintain that, inasmuch as the Lord did not accept this vicarious atonement, but said, "Whosoever has sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book," Judaism rejects the belief in a mediator. But, Dr. Oesterley argues, "The point at issue is not so much as to whether or not the Lord accepted the vicarious atonement, but the fact that it was offered. And by whom was it offered? By Israel's greatest teacher, by the man to whom God revealed the Torah, by the man who, with, perhaps, the exception of Abraham, is more venerated by Hebrews than any other who has ever lived. Was it a wrong suggestion of his, that of vicarious atonement? There is no hint to this effect. If the offer had been unjustified would it have passed unrebuked?" The answer is obvious. There was nothing to rebuke in this offer of Moses. It was one of the noblest prayers ever laid at the Throne of Mercy. To be ready to sacrifice himself for the sake of the nation he loved so wisely and so well! But the Lord would not permit the blood of his faithful servant to be an atonement for the nation's sin. The sacrifice of the saint cannot save the sinner. "In the day when I visit," declared the eternal Judge, "I will visit their sin upon them."

But, asks Dr. Oesterley, how can this statement be reconciled with the passage in Genesis XVIII. 16–33, when Abraham intercedes for the men of Sodom, where God is recorded as saying that if he would find fifty—aye, only ten righteous men within the city, He would not destroy it for their sake? Were not the intercessory prayer of Abraham and the righteousness of ten men the means or mediating element by which all the sinners in the city would be saved? We certainly do believe in the efficacy of intercessory prayer, but we do not hold that an intercessor is required to obtain acceptance of such prayer. Nothing can be more explicit on the subject than the text, "For what nation is there who hath God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for."* The Midrash paraphrases the words, "In the hour of the client's need he cannot go without ceremony into the presence of his patron: he must linger at the door and get a servant to announce him. Even then, it is doubtful whether he will be received. It is not so when men would approach the Almighty. In this wise does He speak to them, 'When ye are in trouble call not on any of the angels, neither on Michael nor on Gabriel; but cry unto Me, and I will answer you straightway.' For doth not Holy Writ say, 'Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered.'"†

When Abraham prayed that Sodom should be spared for the sake of the ten righteous men that would be found there, he did not presume that these men would, by their righteousness, atone for the sinning population. Filled as he was with deepest compassion, he believed that the presence of these virtuous men would indicate that the city was not so hopelessly corrupt as to entail its destruction.

But we do not base our rejection of vicarious atonement upon the interpretation of a single passage. We hold that the doctrine of individual responsibility is clearly taught by the prophets, in the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel, and in Jeremiah xxxi. 30, "Every man shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape his teeth shall be set on edge." And this doctrine is in full accord with our belief in Divine justice. "To many it might be a very comforting thing to believe that they will be saved from the consequences of their sin by a merit not their own, by the merit of a mediator. A dying man will catch at a straw; and a dying sinner would doubtless derive much consolation and courage from such a belief. But what are the consequences? The good man and the sinner would thereby be reduced to the same level. The righteous man who sinned not, and the sinner who sinned, both alike would receive the Divine grace, the former by his own merit, the latter by the merit of his mediator; and the whole end and purpose of our earthly life would be stultified. The probation of this life would be of no avail. It would be as though an examiner, after carefully setting questions, collecting the answers of all the candidates, and registering the results, were to burn all this accumulated evidence of relative intellectual worth, and pass all the candidates, the learned and the ignorant, in one indiscriminate category, regardless of the results of the contest. And if it were so, why should man yield up his pleasures, his passions, his material interests, his self, to good works that may be dispensed with, to virtues that are not necessary? Indeed, the theory of mediation, when carried to its extreme consequences, would be a monstrous reversal of the Divine scheme of man's creation and destiny. No; such cannot be the way of the perfect judge. The Pentateuch and the prophets tell us most unequivocally that it is not, and reason leads us to the like conclusion."*

---

* Deuteronomy IV. 7.

† See the further quotations in *Judaism as Creed and Life*, by the Rev. M. Joseph, p. 79.

I pass on to refute the criticisms contained in an article by the Very Reverend Dean of Chester, "Is there no Atonement ?" which appeared in the February number of *The Expository Times*. His strictures, I am constrained to say, are not characterised by the courtesy and fairness which mark Dr. Oesterley's arguments. His opening observations entirely misrepresent my position. He says, "'For the modern Jew there is no atonement. He is a sinner like the Gentile, and needs forgiveness. He believes that he obtains forgiveness simply by repentance.' So Dr. Adler, the Chief Rabbi." The learned Dean labours under a misapprehension. The entire drift of my discourse is to show that the Jew, like every child of earth, needs atonement, and can achieve it by his confession, his repentance, and his promise of amendment. This doctrine is fully elaborated in another sermon contained in the volume *The Sinners in Zion*.

---

* *Sabbath Readings*, published by the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge, Vol. IV, p. 27, on "Responsibility."

I must also enter an emphatic protest against the insinuation contained in the statement, "He, however, is not of the modern Jews, who reject the Old Testament." What would Dr. Darby say, if I were to assert that the modern Christian rejects the New Testament, because certain preachers of the New Theology discard the creeds of the Church. And with us, the most determined adherent of the school of Higher Criticism does not go beyond the views enunciated by eminent Christian divines, who hold high office. We can afford to smile at the *obiter dictum*, "We cannot expect any Jew to understand the Old Testament." The Jew who for thousands of years has given his life and life's blood to study, and to interpret aright, the sacred records! Would the Christian have been able to render the Hebrew scriptures into the vernacular without the help of the Jew, who claims the sacred language as his mother tongue?

I will proceed to deal with Dr. Darby's argument that the belief in vicarious atonement is supported by the passage in Leviticus xvi. 30, quoted in our prayers, and translated thus: "For on that day shall he (the high priest) make atonement for you, to purify you from all your sins before the Lord, and ye shall be clean." These and other prayers, he asserts, can bear but one meaning, that the high priest offered a sacrifice and made an atonement on account of which God Almighty heard the prayer of His faithful people, and forgave their sins. I submit that this rendering of כי ביום הזה יכפר עליכם, "For on that day shall he, the high priest, make atonement for you," given in the Authorised Version, and followed by some of the older translators of our prayer-book, is incorrect. The verse should be translated as the Revised Version has it, "For on this day shall atonement be made for you." The high priest had to perform certain clearly prescribed functions on the sacred day, but these by themselves did not avail to obtain Divine forgiveness. Nothing can be more diametrically opposed to the letter and spirit of the Divine behest than the supposition that the sprinkled blood of animals could obtain the pardon of Heaven. Before each sacrifice was offered the high priest had to lay his hands upon the head of the sacrifice, and to confess separately his own sin, the sins of his household, and then the transgressions of the whole of Israel. The words of his confession have been preserved: "O God, I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed against Thee, I and my household." If it were true that the high priest, by the sole exercise of his functions, obtained the Divine forgiveness, the Israelites would have been at liberty, on the Atonement Day, to follow their ordinary occupations, to eat and drink and be merry. But it was enjoined that the day was to be a day of solemnity, not merely for the high priest, but for the whole House of Israel. They had to afflict their souls, and abstain from work. The words of admonition spoken by the prophets* indicate clearly that the people had to second the ministrations of the high priest by their prayers, their confession and amendment.

---

* Isaiah LVIII.

A valid proof of the fact that the high priest was not viewed as a mediator or advocate on behalf of the nation can be adduced from the Mishna of *Joma,* which treats of the Temple service on the great day.* It is there stated, that during the seven days prior to the Day of *Kippur,* the high priest was instructed in his high functions by the elders of the nation. He was warned that his duties were clearly defined, that he had no power to alter the prescribed ritual in the slightest detail. The elders thus addressed him: " Revered *Cohen Gadol!* We are the delegates of the nation, and thou art our delegate. We charge thee by Him Whose name rests on this house, that thou alter not of thine own motion any part of the service, but that thou perform it in exact accord with what we have taught thee." We infer from this allocution that the high priest was regarded as the representative, the minister of the nation, but not as their mediator, as though he stood between them and their God. He could in no wise assume any superiority over the rest of the people, but, like them, had to make the shame-stricken confession of his guilt. Hence the rites of the Atonement Day in no wise militate against the Jewish doctrine that each man has to bear his own burden of sin, that he needs no mediator to come between him and his God, that he must work out his own salvation, relying solely on the help and mercy of his Father in Heaven.

The next and last item of criticism to which I have to advert is the Dean's contention that by my statement that prayer is a self-preached sermon I regard the act of supplication as purely subjective, as merely an exercise of the mind and heart educating our nature to higher aspiration. I admit that to prevent my being misunderstood by those who are ignorant of my teachings during the past half-century, I ought, perhaps, to have prefixed my description of prayer by the adverb "*also.*" But surely those who have read other sermons contained in the volume—"The Centenary of the Great Synagogue," "The Nation's Prayer," "A Consecration Sermon"—and the prayers preceding or following the discourses, will readily acknowledge that I regard prayer as something higher and greater even than "a self-preached sermon." Prayer is the whole spiritual action of the soul turned to God as its true and adequate object, the *φυγὴ μόνου πρὸς μόνον*, as Plotinus defines it, the flight of the soul to the One and Only Being, the opening of the heart to Him of Whose goodness all that moves love and admiration on earth is but a pale reflex, the petitioning for Heaven's mercies with the full belief that He hears our supplication, so that by means of prayer every man becomes his own high priest, his own mediator.

---

* c. I, § 5.

H. Adler.

England and the Jewish Land Question

In his article upon "The Jewish Territorial Organisation,"* Mr. Kisch reaches a result which bears a remarkable correspondence with a proposal which I published, under the above title, in the autumn of 1905 in a Berlin Jewish paper. At that time, and in Germany, the subject of "England and the Jewish Land Question" could not secure the attention which, as I believe, my proposals may command in England to-day, in view of the development of the J.T.O.

The secession of the J.T.O. took place at that seventh Zionist Congress which had accepted the principle of practical work in Palestine, and the inclusion of the neighbouring lands in the Zionist sphere of activity. For this reason I endeavoured, at the eleventh hour, to induce Mr. Zangwill and his followers to postpone the threatened secession, anyhow for the period of a Congress, in order to test whether the extension of objects sanctioned by the Congress would not offer them possibilities of immediate colonisation work on a large scale, which purely political and Palestinian Zionism had so far lacked, and the absence of which compelled the foundation of a separate organisation. I pointed out that the two nearest and most important territories in the vicinity of Palestine, the island of Cyprus and the peninsula of Sinai, were under the British Government and British influence, and were therefore bound to commend themselves to Mr. Zangwill and those who with him regretted the rejection of the Uganda proposal.

Unfortunately, the bitterness on both sides had already spread so far that such a resolution for union could not have helped. Mr. Zangwill, however, and his friends readily admitted that a land in the neighbourhood of Palestine would be infinitely preferable to them than any which was remote; and accordingly I endeavoured subsequently, even after the secession was accomplished, to direct the attention of the J.T.O. to these neighbouring lands; more especially as, in spite of their resolution, the Zionists manifested a very small activity in Palestine, and none at all in the countries about it. But, to my regret, Mr. Zangwill took up the position that Cyprus was too small for his purpose. In view of the extent of his operations up to the present, he must now have recognised the colossal error which lay in considering as too small a territory which could receive anyhow about 1,000,000 immigrants. The outcome of the J.T.O.'s schemes relating to East Africa and North America have made them more sympathetic to the Mohammedan Orient (Aden-Cyrenaika), and Mr. Kisch, at the end of his recent article, points directly to an Itoland in "Palestine alone, or together with the neighbouring territories." I think, then, that this is the time and a favourable opportunity to set out the advantages which would result, if Zionists and Itoists could agree upon some common advance along the greater land programme of "Palestine and the neighbouring countries."

---

* See *The Jewish Review*, p. 68.

In the first place, Mr. Zangwill may reckon it as a permanent service that he has succeeded in winning a large number of leading Jews for the idea of a Jewish settlement. Before the interest of these newly-won circles is again lost, since the Ito have not succeeded in finding a land suitable to their special demands, I should like to make yet another attempt to point out to them the land which lies closest to their original designs and falls in with their development down to the present moment.

In his recent article Mr. Kisch defines as the most desirable form of an Itoland a territory that should be large, fertile, and unpopulated. At the same time he admits that it would be sufficient to find a land thinly populated, which through a gradual and peaceable Jewish immigration could be turned into a land with a Jewish majority. Finally, he regards it as possible that streams of wandering Jews might unconsciously and gradually come together in such numbers as to form a Jewish majority, from which all the rest of the plan would develop; and in this connection he comes to the conclusion of his remarks where he speaks of " Palestine alone, or Palestine with the neighbouring countries."

It was hardly necessary to speak of the Jewish immigration into Palestine as of some unconscious process, which might ultimately lead to the fulfilment of the ideal of the J.T.O. The immigration into Palestine, since the first steps of the Chovevi-Zion movement, can be proved to be a fully conscious advance to the fulfilment of the Zionist ideal. But from the moment that the J.T.O. expresses its agreement with a land programme of " Palestine and its neighbouring lands," which is in other words the land programme of the Zionist movement since the seventh Congress, the two organisations would, from the point of view of their land policy, be identical. The difference would remain that while the Zionists, since the latest development in the Orient, have " neither rhyme nor reason " for working anywhere but in Palestine itself, it would be more in keeping with the existing outlook of the J.T.O. to work in the neighbouring countries. At the same time the force would be taken out of Mr. Zangwill's objection that Palestinian Zionism cannot be considered as a practical solution, because in the most favourable circumstances Palestine could only hold a part of the Jewish people. For Palestine alone this objection has a certain justification; when the neighbouring lands are taken into consideration, the argument loses its point.

To consider now the lands in the vicinity of Palestine, there is in the north the autonomous province of Lebanon, which forms for us not only a political, but also a natural frontier. The province of Lebanon is, for a mountainous country, already fairly thickly populated; besides which the district already enjoys autonomy based upon its Christian majority, with police powers and other rights of the kind. On the east, Palestine has no clearly-defined frontiers. Here is stretched the Syrian-Arabian wilderness, which in the neighbourhood of the Turkish frontier has largely the character of prairies, that in old times, under regular cultivation, exhibited great fertility. Should the land west of Jordan and the western parts of Transjordania once again become thickly colonised by the introduction of a continually increasing population, the limits of the settled region would be continuously extended towards the east into a tract which is now a treeless wilderness of arid plains; so that in this direction there would be great possibilities of expansion in Palestine. To the south and south-south-east, Palestine borders upon the northern parts of Turkish Arabia and the Sinai Peninsula, which is at present almost unpopulated. There is no distinct frontier between the south of Palestine and the north of the Turkish-Arabian province of Hedscha. Hence of late years the boundaries of Palestine have been extended farther and farther to the south, so that the Mutessariflik of Jerusalem has come to embrace more and more southerly districts. These localities likewise, which now for the most part are waste, were formerly fertile and cultivated, and could be so again: so that here also are possibilities of expansion into places where there is no danger of running up against a foreign sphere of interest, or of having to reckon with a settled population.

Between the district which impinges upon the south of Palestine and the Sinai Peninsula, there lies the Turkish-Egyptian frontier (a fairly straight line between

Refah and Akaba). On the farther side, by the northern edge of the Sinai Peninsula, we have the district of El-Arisch, which to-day is almost entirely a wilderness, and which similarly in olden times was fruitful and populated. This district is distinguished from those which we have hitherto considered by the fact that it is already under English influence, and thus enjoys numerous advantageous conditions which could only be secured in Turkish countries in process of time.

We have now exhausted the land frontiers of Palestine, but there are other neighbouring lands on the side of the sea. In an extended sense we might include among them the province of Cyrenaica (Benghazi), which belongs to Turkish North Africa, and has already been considered by Mr. Zangwill for the J.T.O., but abandoned on the strength of a Report which I have reason to regard as not being final for our present purpose.

The nearest territory to Palestine upon the side of the sea is the island of Cyprus, which is under English administration, and having only a sparse population, could readily receive somewhere near a million immigrants. If this figure seemed trifling to Mr. Zangwill when his organisation was in the spring of its youth, he must now recognise that it is far too large a number to be planted by one organisation in any land whatever. All that an organisation can do is to give the word of release, to see to the preliminary arrangements, and to bring capital into the land. But in the case of a land which is under the best conceivable Government, it should do this, at any rate, without hesitation. It can call into being the small preparatory works of colonisation, and it can spread information among the immigrants and among those who are interested from a business point of view in Jewish colonisation, or capitalists who are likely to be interested.

In this way the J.T.O. could still embark upon active work in harmony with its own purpose and with the Zionist organisation from which it was derived. Such a scheme should find especial favour with Mr. Zangwill and the other English followers of the J.T.O., because in Cyprus they would be dealing with a territory administered by England, and the immigrants would find appreciably easier conditions than yet pertain in other parts of the Turkish Empire.

The Sinai Peninsula ranks far behind Cyprus in the quality of the soil. I have only included it at this moment in the project, because the Zionists at the time of the Uganda project absolutely refused to hear anything about Cyprus; while from their standpoint at the time they could raise no objection to Sinai, which partly belongs to the historic Palestine.

The Sinai Peninsula is not, however, unimportant, when we remember that within a few years the railway system of Egypt (and indirectly of the whole of Africa) must undoubtedly be linked up with the network of Asia Minor, and that this can only take place by the route of The-Suez-Canal–El-Arisch–Gaza. Hence a district, which is to-day not altogether useless, will obtain a special significance for us in the near future.

Seeing that the J.T.O. would hardly have separated itself from Zionism, had there been another territory under favourable administrative conditions at its disposal besides Palestine, which was then considered as a closed area, seeing further that the extended land programme of the J.T.O. now presents them the opportunity of displaying their activity, in accordance with their own designs, in territories which enjoy English administration, and having in view these developments, the common advance of the two organisations upon one line is now rendered possible. Nothing stands in the way to prevent each of them from working farther in its own special sphere for the accomplishment of their common aim, which is, "The building up of a Jewish majority as the basis of a Jewish settlement which will continually spread its limits from land to land."

Davis Trietsch.

Græco-Roman Criticism of Some Jewish Observances and Beliefs *

(*Concluded*)

4. In his note about the refusal of the Jews to rise on the Sabbath against an enemy, Plutarch incidentally adds the remark that the Jews were sitting in unfulled clothes. He must either have copied this detail from his source, or have observed the Jews in his country, Bœotia, thus attired on the Sabbath. In either case this is a strange statement, contradicting all that we know about the observance of the Sabbath, especially the well-known rule of the rabbis (*Mechiltha*, 70*a*) to honour the Sabbath by food, drink, and clean clothes. Unfulled garments would befit the Sabbath less than a day of mourning; but they would be in keeping with the generally adopted view of Greek and Roman writers that the Jewish Sabbath was a fast day. Juvenal, the Roman satirist, about the year 100, said (*Satire* VI, 159): "In Judæa the kings celebrate the festival of Sabbath barefooted." The commentators, naturally, are at a loss to explain what Juvenal meant, and they assume that he invented the detail in derision. This method of interpretation is the easiest possible, and requires no study of Jewish customs. The satire containing this difficult statement is otherwise quite correct in its information about the Jewish prince, Agrippa II, and his sister Bereniké, and about the abstinence of Jews from swine flesh. It is, therefore, hardly justifiable to treat the one point as an invention. We know, in fact, from Talmudic sources that everybody, whether an

---

* Presidential address read to the Jews' College Literary Society on February 5th, 1910.

ordinary Jew or a king, had to take off his shoes or sandals before entering the area of the Temple in Jerusalem; and Juvenal, who must have copied all the other details from an earlier author, may have found this too; and he may have referred the custom of visiting the Temple barefooted to the Sabbath because princes visited the Temple only on a Sabbath; and it is possible that Juvenal observed the Jews of Rome entering their synagogues barefooted and applied this habit to the Jewish prince Agrippa. Some scholars think that Juvenal noticed in Rome that on the Day of Atonement the Jews went to their synagogues barefooted, and generalising his observation he extended it to every Sabbath. Or, and this is a suggestion of some probability, it may be that some Jews observed the Sabbath as a fast day, on which, as a sign of mourning, they wore no shoes.

Trogus Pompeius, who wrote a history of the world in the beginning of the first century and paid special attention to Asiatic countries, claimed to know the origin of the fast on the Sabbath. Moses, he said, after leaving Egypt, arrived in his old native country, Damascus, and took possession of Mount Sinai after the people had endured a march of fatigue and fast of seven days through the Arabian desert; hence the Jews devoted for all times the seventh day, that is called by them Sabbath, to fasting, because that day put an end to their starvation and their wanderings (*Justin*, 36, 2). Tacitus likewise said (*Historiæ*, V, 4) that the Jews still observe frequent fasts in memory of their long starvation when coming out from Egypt. Tacitus and Trogus Pompeius probably copied these learned suggestions from Lysimachos, the well-known Alexandrian anti-Semite of the first century B.C.E., and it seems that the idea of the Sabbath as a fast day was started and propagated by Greek authors. Among them even Strabo, the serious and reliable historian and geographer, mentions it.

The notion is generally considered to be a blunder, due, according to some scholars, to the observation that the Jews prepared no food on the Sabbath, which led the Greek and Roman authors to the assumption that the Jews fasted. Other scholars assume that they mistook the Sabbath for the Day of Atonement, especially since the Day of Atonement is designated in the Pentateuch "Sabbath of Sabbaths." Neither explanation is satisfactory, for we find that Plutarch, who speaks about the unfulled garments of the Jews on the Sabbath, knew that the Jews did not fast on the Sabbath, at least not from its commencement on Friday night. In order to prove that the Jews worshipped Bacchus, the god of wine, he refers to some characteristic customs of the Jews. "When they observe the Sabbath, they incite each other to drink and to get drunk; and if any grave reason prevents them from doing so, they are bound to taste at least of unmixed wine" (*Symposia,* VI). Obviously Plutarch refers here to the Kiddush, at which the master of a Jewish house passes the cup of wine round the table, and every member of the company is expected to drink of it. Yet it must be pointed out at once that this strange statement of Plutarch need not have precluded the same author from considering the Sabbath a fast day; for he described here only the night introducing the Sabbath, and not the following day. And Persius Flaccus, a Roman satirist, writing between the years 34 and 62, described a table laid by a poor Jew for the Sabbath in the following words (*Satire* V, 180): "The lamps are arranged and adorned with violets spreading a thick smoke, when Herod's days come; the tail of a fish is floating in sauce in an earthenware vessel; and a white jug is filled to the brim with wine. Then thou movest silently thy lips and art pale because of the Sabbath." It is hardly possible to refer this vivid description to the preparations for the night following the Sabbath, for no lamps had to be prepared for הבדלה. And it is clearly a picture of

Friday night. The paleness caused by the Sabbath is explained by the commentators to be the fast of the Sabbath. But how is this possible, since the meal stands on the table awaiting the master, and the fast cannot have commenced yet ? The fish and the wine clearly indicate the Sabbath, and no reference to the Day of Atonement is possible. There is probably some mistake in the heaping of all the details on the Friday night, and the fast must be referred to the day of the Sabbath. Among other instances of the same idea among the Romans, in a letter to Tiberius the Emperor Augustus writes (Sueton. *Augustus*, 76), in the first years of the first century : "No Jew keeps the fast of the Sabbath as strictly as I have kept to-day." And the satirist Martial, in the year 88, speaks of Jewesses fasting on the Sabbath (*Epigram.* IV, 4). The description of the Sabbath as a fast day, repeated by serious men, is too positive to be explained as a gross mistake ; and even if a mistake, its origin requires some explanation.

A well-known passage of Isaiah (LVIII. 13) contains a clear statement as to the character of the Sabbath. "If thou turnest away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on the holy day ; and call the Sabbath a *delight*, the holy of the Lord, honourable, and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own words : Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." No doubt the conception of the Sabbath as a delight excludes the fast which would have attached the character of mourning. And we know from express statements that as early as the first century B.C.E., the Sabbath was not merely a day of complete rest from all kind of work, but also a day of joy. In the story of Judith (chapter VIII. 6), we read that Judith fasted all the days of her widowhood, save the eves of the Sabbaths and the Sabbaths, and the eves of the new moon and the new moons, and the feasts and the solemn days of the house of Israel. But the date of the composition of the story of Judith is still a matter of dispute, and therefore more definite data must be, and can be, adduced for the special meals on the Sabbath. Shammai said (*Mechiltha R. Simon*, 107): "Think of the Sabbath, before it enters, and observe the Sabbath after it has entered." It is reported of Shammai that he never ceased referring to the Sabbath. When he found some good food he said, "This will be kept for the Sabbath" (*Bezah*, 16*a*; *Mekhiltha*, 69*a*). About fifty years after Shammai we find the same preparations in honour of the Sabbath reported in the name of Eleazar B. Hananiah B. Hizkiah B. Garon, the leader of the national movement against the Romans in the year 66. Josephus, in his Biography (§ 54), describes a meeting held in the synagogue of Tarichea during the revolt in the year 67, and says: "The meeting concluded owing to the approach of the sixth hour, which is the usual time for the breakfast on the Sabbath." Obviously, this custom had not sprung up in the times of Josephus, but was in vogue before him.*

The extraordinary emphasis laid upon Shammai's honouring the Sabbath by special food and meals seems to have some special import. Again, in the second century, R. José B. Halaftha, the well-known Tanna of Sepphoris, in Galilee, emphasised the great duty and merit of joy and of the Sabbath meals by saying (*Sabb.* 118*b*): "To him who observes the Sabbath in joy, his heart's desires are granted. May I have a share in the reward of those who fulfil the duty of three meals on the Sabbath." In the following generation it was Bar-Kappara who gave expression to the same idea in very strong terms. The stress laid on these meals suggests with some probability the inference that there were some who on principle refused to honour the Sabbath in this way, and considered the Sabbath a day of stern character, not proper for feasting, but only for the plainest food, perhaps even for fasting. This suggestion, which may at first sight appear unwarranted, is supported by the *Book of Jubilees,* which enjoins, on the one hand, even stricter rest on the Sabbath than Shammai, and on the other hand emphasises the Sabbath meals. As it is said (2, 21): "And thus God created in the Sabbath a sign, in accordance with which they should keep the Sabbath with the angels on the seventh day, to eat and to drink and to bless him who has created all things. (25) Therefore he commanded on its behalf that whosoever does any work thereon shall die, and that he who defiles it shall surely die. (31) And the creator of all things blessed it; but he did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep the Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone; them alone he permitted to eat and to drink and to keep Sabbath thereon on the earth." If the words of the last sentence, "Israel alone be permitted to eat and to drink on the Sabbath," bear any interpretation, they imply that other people were not allowed to eat and to drink on the Sabbath. The non-Jews, among whom the author of the *Book of Jubilees* lived, must have refrained on the seventh day of the week from eating and drinking, i.e. they fasted. Again he says (50, 9): "Ye shall do no work whatever on the Sabbath day, save what ye have prepared for yourselves on the sixth day, so as to eat and to drink and to rest and to keep Sabbath from all work on that day and to bless the Lord your God, who has given you a day of festival and a holy day and a day of the holy kingdom for all Israel. (10) For great is the honour which the Lord has given to Israel that they should eat and drink and be satisfied on that festival day, and rest thereon from all labour. . . . (12) And every man who does any work thereon or goes on a journey or tills land, whether in his house or any other place, or whoever lights a fire or rides on any beast, or travels by ship on the sea, or whoever strikes or kills anything, or slaughters a beast or a bird, or whoever catches an animal or a bird or a fish, or *whoever fasts* or makes war on the

---

* On the stage of Cæsarea in Palestine in the third century the Jews were ridiculed for spending all the money that they earned during the week on meals on the Sabbath (Midrash Echa, *Prooem.* 17).

Sabbaths, (13) the man who does any of these things on the Sabbath shall die." Is it not very striking to find here not only a commandment to eat and to drink on the Sabbath, but also a very strict prohibition against fasting, which is to be punished by death ? Is not this unusual emphasis some proof that the Sabbath was considered even by some section of Jews as a fast day ? If we knew where the *Book of Jubilees* was composed, it would be possible to trace these Jews ; but unfortunately scholars have as yet not succeeded in settling the question.

Jewish literature, as far as I know, contains no reference to any section of observant Jews that observed the Sabbath as a fast day or in any other manner approaching a fast day. Only the Essenes and the Samaritans had some extremely strict observances on the Sabbath which have no parallel in Jewish practice. According to Josephus (*Wars*, VI, 8, 9) the Essenes dared not move a vessel on the Sabbath. But in spite of this they did not fast on that day, since Josephus expressly mentions that they prepared their food on Friday for the Sabbath. The same applies to the Samaritans, who interpret Exodus XVI, 29 as a prohibition against moving from a place on the Sabbath. Of Dositheos, the founder of a Samaritan sect, Origen, a church-father of the third century, reports (*De Princ.* IV, 17) a very strict observance of the Sabbath rest, including the prohibition to move from one's place or to change one's position. His followers were forbidden to drink on the Sabbath from metal or glass vessels (*Hilgenfeld, Ketzergeschichte*, 161). This rule, however, would show that they did not fast on the Sabbath. Perhaps there were differences on this point among different sections of the Samaritans. We know that Samaritans lived in Alexandria and elsewhere in Egypt in great numbers from the third century B.C.E. ; and it is possible that the Greek authors who first spoke of the Sabbath as a fast day, had noticed the Samaritan observance. There were influential

Samaritans also in Rome; one of them, as we only incidentally learn from Josephus (*Antiquit.* XVIII, 6, 4), Thallus, a freed slave of the Emperor Tiberius, was a rich man and lent Agrippa I a million drachmæ. The Roman and Alexandrian authors did not distinguish between Jews and Samaritans, and may have attributed to the Jews what they had noticed only in the case of Samaritans. I know well that there are several objections to this explanation of the Greek and Roman conception of the Sabbath as a fast day; but the clear statement in the *Book of Jubilees*, supported by the insistence of Shammai, R. Josê B. Halaftha, and Bar-Kappara on the Sabbath meals invites this or a similar theory. The Jews in Galilee to whom the rabbis addressed themselves in their remarks on the joy of Sabbath may have held the same view of the observance of the Sabbath, having been influenced by the Samaritans in this respect as in other points of religious practice.

5. Greek and Roman authors noticed not only that Jews fasted on the Sabbath, but also other features of the day of rest on which it is almost certain that the Roman Jews did not differ from those of other countries of the diaspora and of Palestine. Of the Jews in Judæa, Jerome, in the fourth century, reports that they spent the Sabbath in sitting idle, sleeping, or enjoying meals. He deliberately passes by the spiritual occupation of the Jews on the Sabbath. But according to Josephus (*Antiquit.* XVI, 2, 4): "The seventh day of every week is set aside for teaching our laws and customs, in order that the prescriptions the observance of which guards us from sins, as well as all other truths, should be taken to heart." And in another passage (*Contra Ap.* II, 7): "Moses instituted that we should hear the Torah not only once or twice or several times, but he commanded us to give up on every seventh day all other work, in order to assemble together for the purpose of listening to the Torah and learning it thoroughly." And Philo (*De Septennario,* § 6, II, 282), in his rhetorical

statement as to the number of synagogues, says that in all cities thousands of schools are open on the Sabbath where understanding, moderation, firmness of character, justice, and all virtues are being taught. A treatise falsely attributed to Philo prohibits on the Sabbath every kind of work except praising God in the congregation of the elders and glorifying him in the assembly of the wise. This much we learn from Jewish sources about the occupation of Jews on the Sabbath.

Greek and Roman authors noticed the same thing. It is true their knowledge of the service in the Temple of Jerusalem on the Sabbath is very poor. Dio Cassius, a Roman statesman and historian, in describing (about the year 200) the conquest of Jerusalem by Sosius and King Herod in the year 37 B.C.E. (49, 22, 6), reports the religious zeal of the Jews during the war. Those Jews who had been taken captives at the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, asked the Roman general on the Sabbath for permission to visit the besieged Temple, and when permitted to do so, they performed with their brethren the legal practices. If this incident is correctly referred to a Sabbath, we can hardly state what religious practices were meant; but it is more probable that one of the festivals of pilgrimage was referred to, which the captive Jews were eager to attend in accordance with the law. Clearer and more definite was Agatharchides, whose jeers at the Jewish Sabbath I have quoted before. In his short report on the superstition of the Jews who would not fight on the Sabbath, Agatharchides incidentally remarks that the Jews remained until evening in the sacred places and prayed, stretching out their hands. Since he speaks of several sacred places, he seems to have had in mind, not the Temple, but the synagogues; and his note would then, to my knowledge, be the earliest reference of a Greek author to synagogues. Great interest would attach to this incidental remark, if we only knew whether the author of his source or he himself observed Jews in his or any other country who prayed on the Sabbath all day in the synagogue, or whether it occurred only in great distress. The practice is suggested nowhere else; but if it actually prevailed anywhere, it would imply that those Jews fasted on the Sabbath.

Of the Roman authors, Ovid, the poet of the beginning of the current era, referred to ceremonies observed by the Jews on the seventh day (*Ars amatoria*, I, 75, 415). Dio Cassius (27, 16) said that the Sabbath was sacred to Saturn, and the Jews performed many singular practices on that day and did no serious work. The lighting of lamps to which several Roman authors pointed, or the Kiddush could hardly have appeared singular to them, since similar customs were also connected with the worship of Roman gods. The satirist Persius Flaccus, who has described the preparations of a poor Jew for the Sabbath, has been already mentioned. And Seneca, the Stoic philosopher who taught others how to check their passions and their temper, wrote in a letter (95): "The lamps on the Sabbath should be prohibited, for the gods do not want light and men do not like the smoke." Another remark of his about the Jews explains why he lost his temper over the Jewish Sabbath lamps, which harmed nobody: "The customs of this horrible people have prevailed to such an extent that they have been accepted over the whole earth; the conquered have given laws to their conquerors" (*De Superstitione*, 42). Many cultured Romans, several poets, and many ladies, especially of the highest classes, observed the Jewish Sabbath and lighted lamps in honour of the day. Juvenal complained about the year 100 (*Sat.*, XIV, 96 ff.) of Romans who observed the Sabbath, and prayed only to the clouds and to the god of the heaven, but made no distinction between the flesh of a man and that of a swine. "Soon," he continues, "he will become a Jew of the covenant, and, having been brought up to despise the Roman religion, he will observe and honour the Jewish law only. And all this merely because his father spent in idleness every seventh day, without taking any part in the duties of life." Josephus, who, about the same time, composed his books on Jewish history in Rome, said (*Contra Apionem*, II, 3, § 9): "There is no Greek or non-Greek city or people where the observance would not be found of the seventh day which we keep, and of the fasts and the lighting of lamps, and of many of the prohibitions concerning food." In this list of observances the lights might be those of Friday night or of Chanuccah. But since there is no other trace of the Chanuccah lights having been observed by non-Jews, it is more probable that Josephus referred to the Sabbath lights which had found so many adherents. In this case the fasts in his list stand between the Sabbath lights and the Sabbath, which position would indicate that the fasts also refer to the Sabbath, and that Josephus knew Jews and Romans who fasted on the day. It is noteworthy that Tertullian, the famous Latin church father of the third century in North Africa, reproached the heathens of his times with the observance of the same Jewish customs (*Ad Nationes*, I, 13): "You observe the Sabbaths and the holy meal, and the Jewish custom of the lights and the fasts, together with the unleavened bread and prayers on the seashore, customs which all are foreign to your gods." It is to be regretted that the whole attention of the Roman writers was engrossed by the customs of the Jews practised on Friday night, and that they neglected the practices of the Sabbath day. And yet the many synagogues in Rome of the first century establish the fact that the Jews there, as in other countries, spent the Sabbath in attending the service. Philo, who in the year 40 stayed for some time in Rome as the representative of the Jews of Alexandria, expressly stated (*Legatio ad Caium*, § 23, II, 568), that the Jews of Rome assembled every Sabbath in the synagogues to study publicly their ancient philosophy, i.e. the Torah.

6. Roman and Greek misconceptions about the Sabbath appear most remarkably in the statement of Tacitus and of other writers that the Jewish Sabbath was a day sacred to Saturn. Albius Tibullus, about the year 20 B.C.E., was, as far as I know, the first Roman author to make the assertion, but he can hardly have invented it, and others must have preceded him. Tacitus knew more about it (*Historiœ*, V, 4): "Others say that the observance of the Sabbath was an honour to Saturn, either because the principles of their religion were given to the Jews by the people of Ida (on Crete), of whom we learn that they were exiled with Saturn and were the founders of the Jewish nation. Or the seventh day was observed on account of the seven stars which govern human affairs; and among them the star of Saturn moves in the highest sphere and has the greatest power, and because most stars finish their ways and courses in periods of seven years." Dio Cassius subsequently refers to this opinion in the same way, in calling the Sabbath the day of Kronos, on which the Jews did not defend Jerusalem against Pompey (37, 16). Since we know that the Romans learnt from orientals to assign the days of the week to the seven planets, in the first instance from the Egyptians, it is very probable that the 'others' who gave the above explanation of the Sabbath were also Egyptians. Further, the whole paragraph of Tacitus on the origin and the beliefs of the Jews was copied from the work of Apion, the Alexandrian anti-Semite. There is little doubt that the reference to Saturn, or Kronos, as the god of the Sabbath, is also due to Apion. That neither Apion nor Tacitus took the trouble to inquire whether the Jews connected the days of the week in any way with the seven planets will not surprise us; for any baseless suggestion concerning the Jewish religion was good enough to be included in a learned book.

Yet it is always the duty of the historian to accept a tradition as true, even when reported by an Apion, unless there is convincing evidence against it; and we must assume that the Jews connected the Sabbath, if not with the worship, at least with the movements of Saturn. Why should not the Jews also have learnt this from the Babylonians? According to some Bible commentators כיון צלמיכם in Amos v. 26, means the planet Saturn, which is so named in Assyrian, Persian, and Arabic; and it would seem that the Hebrews worshipped among other stars, Saturn, under the form of a planet. The Assyrian credited Saturn, the planet or the planetary deity, with malignant influence and called it the dark star. But, at the same time, modern scholars have concluded that, though Saturn was the star ruling on the seventh day, there is no connection between the Jewish Sabbath and Saturn. We find, indeed, that the Jewish rabbis in the Talmud called Saturn the planet of the Sabbath, but they did so because the planet appeared among the seven as ruler in the sky on every seventh day of the week. We read too in the Talmud (*Sabb.* 156*a*) that R. Joshua B. Levi of the third century in Judæa, connected every one's character and fate with the day of the week on which he was born.

But neither he nor any of the Rabbis suggests any connection between Saturn and the Jews. On the other hand, we learn that the Saba, a Semitic tribe that preserved its heathen worship down to the middle ages (Chwolson, *Ssabier*), had ideas of Saturn which Greek and Roman authors attribute to the Jews, and worshipped him as a dangerous, evil godhead. Apion may have heard of this worship of some Semitic people in Palestine and attributed it to the Jews. The statement that people of Ida in Crete founded the Jewish nation suggests that he had heard of the Philistines, who, according to the Bible, came from Crete to Palestine (Amos IX. 7; Gen. X. 14; Zeph. II. 5).

Curious is the further elaboration of the relation between the Sabbath and Saturn. A late Latin author in Gaul, Rutilius Namatianus, wrote, in 416, that the Jews observed the cold days of the Sabbath with all their heart, which is even colder (i.e. more foolish) than their religion—spending every seventh day in shameful laziness, imitating their weary god. The idea that the planet Saturn is sad and cold (*Juvenal*, VI, 569) is known also from elsewhere, and an anonymous author ascribes the cold food of the Jews on the Sabbath to the coldness of Saturn (Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs Grecs*, 359, 3). It is of special interest to find that Meleager, of Gadara, in Palestine, a Greek poet of the first century B.C.E., termed the Sabbath cold (V, 163). We do not know what was his reason ; perhaps he saw the Jews of Gadara observe the Sabbath in a way that struck him as cold. But the fact that he was a Palestinian anti-Semite, writing in Greek incidentally about the Jews and Jewish religion, suggests that the material adduced by anti-Semitic Greek writers in Asia Minor and the Greek isles, emanated from Greek writers born in Palestinian Greek cities. Askalon, the great city of Philistia, the population of which bitterly hated the Jews, produced four Stoic philosophers (one of them a teacher of Cicero), and two grammarians, and two historians. Gadara gave to the world, besides Meleager, an epicurean philosopher, whose writings were discovered in Herculaneum, and a satirist and a rhetor, who became the teacher of the Emperor Tiberius. Who knows how much hatred emanated from these Palestinians and settled in Alexandria ?

With this question I conclude my rather long observations on the criticism of Greek and Roman authors, as my whole paper has raised more questions than I could answer. I have placed before you the sometimes foolish statements of enlightened Greek and Roman writers, not all true and not all benevolent. I have given some comments on them, and some suggestions, I am quite aware, not all convincing. I should like only to point to one of several lessons, not at all superfluous, to be derived from the perverse assertions and haughty blunders of the Greeks and Romans. As experience teaches, the substitution of abuse for argument is a sign of lack of culture or of fear. Nobody will accuse the Greek and Roman writers of poor culture; but it may be confidently maintained that conscious or unconscious fear of the spiritual power of the Jewish religion was underlying their abuse. Their derision is the strongest evidence of the power of Judaism and its institutions. The lesson which a consideration of their criticisms teaches us is this: When Judaism is abused from outside or from inside, whether the institutions of its remote or its nearer past are fiercely attacked, let us remember that for the most part such laws, customs, and institutions are abused by modern representatives of Greek and Roman thought and culture, as have proved the strongholds not only of Judaism, but also of humanity, and at the same time strengthen us to resist even nowadays the clouding of the pure conception of God and the weakening of Israel's mission in the world. The bolder the attacks grow, the more firmly let us cling to the institutions. Eighteen centuries have passed over us since the diatribes of Tacitus; and when another eighteen centuries will have passed over us, historians will, we hope, reveal in modern criticism the same spirit as actuated the Greek and Roman historians and geographers, poets and philosophers, in their judgment of Judaism in general and of the Sabbath in particular—fear of their spiritual power.

A. Büchler.

The Birth of the Alliance Israélite Universelle (1789–1860)

The fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Alliance has recently been celebrated. Half a century has elapsed since, in the month of May, 1860, six Parisian Jews laid the foundation of what Oscar S. Straus, United States Ambassador at Constantinople, has called "the noblest institution that has worked with such signal success for the uplifting of the sons and daughters of Israel." The jubilee of the Alliance would have been celebrated by the whole of modern Jewry, if modern Jewry constituted a whole, united in aims and aspirations. But "as the number of thy cities, O Israel, is the number of thy gods." Jewry is divided, not into parties—would that we had parties—but into sections which do not agree even as to their common interests. The work of civic emancipation and intellectual regeneration, undertaken and maintained by the Alliance, should command the good opinion and admiration of all. Yet we find it but indifferently appreciated in certain quarters. Although the Alliance does not lack friends, it has its hostile critics; some reproach it with sacrificing the religious interests of Jewry, others its national interests; others maintain that the Alliance is geographically and historically situated, not at the centre of the Jewish sphere, but at its circumference, and that its atmosphere and influence are un-Jewish. "The Torah shall not go forth from France, nor the Hebrew tongue from Paris."

It would be idle to ask what the Alliance would have become had it been founded in London, or what it would become were it translated to Berlin. We may, however, justly say that it was not without reason that it originated in Paris, and that circumstances impelled French Jewry, and destined it, as it were, to bring forth and direct this great work. It was not mere chance that France was its cradle. The year 1860 is not a date which stands detached and isolated in the history of French Jews; it is, on the contrary, the culminating point of many antecedent circumstances. From 1789 onwards the Jews of France passed through a number of experiences which make their history a kind of résumé of the history of the whole of modern Jewry.

I

On September 27th, 1791, the Constituent Assembly was on the eve of departure. The new Constitution of France had been passed, when Adrien Duport mounted the tribune and said:

"I have to place before the Assembly a very short statement, which appears to me of the highest importance. You have laid down, gentlemen, what are the qualities necessary for all citizens of France. But there is one resolution which seems to contradict the general laws thus laid down. I refer to the laws affecting the Jews. I demand the repeal of that decree, and I wish the House to declare that the Jews, like all other persons, can become citizens by fulfilling the conditions laid down by the Constitution. No distinction should be made in political rights on account of religious beliefs." The proposition of M. Duport was adopted, after some discussion, amid applause.

France did not, in emancipating the Jews, act for herself alone. She served as an example to the nations, and the circumstances under which this charter was given can still serve to point a moral. The Jews in France before 1789 were, generally speaking, in a similar situation to that of the Jews in Russia to-day. The majority were confined to a "zone," viz. Alsace. Outside this province the only officially recognised community was that of Metz; Jews who had managed to settle in Paris and other places were tolerated under police supervision. In Bordeaux and Bayonne they received more privileged treatment; but the Jews had been admitted to these towns in the sixteenth century as "Noveaux Chrétiens." Outside these communities the intellectual level was exceedingly low, and the economic condition wretchedly poor.

No one could have guessed, on the eve of the Revolution, that the dawn of the day of liberty was at hand for the Jews. In 1784, when Louis XVI's ministers dealt with the Jewish question, their laws were bigoted and feeble. The "ancien régime" was powerless to do away with a condition based on the same principles as itself. Modern France could not have come into being without the Revolution—nothing less was required to break down the forces of the past. It was tradition which made the Jews slaves. The Revolution was to give them their freedom. Accordingly the defenders of the Jews demanded for them the rights of citizens in the name of the new principles. Their emancipation was to be no political stratagem, nor humanitarian sentiment, nor concession, nor precaution: purely and simply an act of justice. Jews must be free because human beings are free.

For two years after the Assembly had pronounced the emancipation of the Jews, the subject was continuously before the public at meetings, in the Press, etc., until finally the side of freedom gained the day. In this struggle the Jews were not merely passive; they did not wait for freedom to come to them, but insistently demanded it. A committee entrusted with the defence of their interests was chosen as soon as the États Généraux assembled. At first, indeed, their attitude was very humble. Thus Ber Isaac Ber, their spokesman to the Constituent Assembly, on October 14th, 1789, begs the members to listen "*with some interest to the hesitating claims which they dare to formulate in the midst of their profound humiliation.*" Soon, however, their voices are raised; the atmosphere of freedom is conducive to rapid growth. They are no longer satisfied to ask for a little more air and light in their prison, but they desire to leave it altogether. They demand the right to be citizens. Their just claims to this title, the advantage which France will gain, the harmful consequences of decrees against them, these and many other arguments are put forward with the energy and boldness of men who demand not mercy, but justice.

If the Jews of France deserved their emancipation by the energy with which they demanded it, they soon showed that they were worthy of it, by their devotion to their "newly-regained fatherland." There were some, no doubt, who could not rise at once to the level of the new régime. When one issues from a cave after long imprisonment, the eyes require some little time to become accustomed to the light of day. But they soon made up for lost time. Just as in Russia to-day, so in 1791 did their enemies predict that their emancipation would be the signal for a massacre; or else that they would make use of their freedom to ruin the country. Not only did these prophecies prove false, but a mere half century was sufficient to transform a wretched population of small dealers and pedlars, scattered over country districts, into wealthy urban communities engaged in commerce and industries, helping to build up the prosperity of the country. The Revolution emancipated the Jews of France, and French Jewry restored the good name of the Jew. The example of France has shown that States have everything to gain by treating the Jews as citizens.

II

The rapid improvement in French Jewry was due in great part to the distinguished few in their midst who, after obtaining political freedom themselves, taught their brethren the duties attached to the title of citizen. No sooner had the Constituent Assembly passed its law of liberation than Ber Isaac Ber, of Nancy, addressed an open letter to his co-religionists. "If we ourselves," he wrote, "cannot enjoy the blessings which the new Constitution holds in store, we shall at least see our children gather the first fruits of this precious tree." Religious instruction must be given in French; the Bible must be translated into French; schools must be built where the children can learn to be "good Jews and good French citizens at the same time. . . . Let us establish communal training schools, so that the poorer children may be taught those trades and handicrafts which are indispensable to every society. . . ."

Would the French Jews share their emancipation with their co-religionists in the neighbouring lands? Would they, from the social ladder which they had begun to climb, hold out a helping hand to those who remained below, or were they going to turn away from them, just because of their vastly superior position? Erstwhile they had distrusted each other. The "Portuguese" looked down on the "Avignonnais," who looked down on the "Tudesques." The "Lorrains" scorned the "Alsatians," who despised the Polish Jews. The Revolution quickly decided their course of action. The heralds of new ideas, sowing freedom and fraternity in Europe, wherever the republican armies went, peoples were freed and the Ghetto walls thrown down. The Jews of the Rhine lands and Northern Italy were liberated, and their defence undertaken by France. When, in 1801, the idea of a European congress at Lunéville was projected, Michel Ber, son of Ber Isaac Ber and the first Jewish lawyer in France, issued an appeal " to the Justice of Nations and Kings " on behalf of all the Jews of Europe. The appeal is from the Jew not as such, but as a French citizen. "It is therefore as a citizen of France, as an earnest friend of humanity, that I plead the cause of a nation whose defects are due to the ceaseless persecution of enemies, and whose virtues are its own." The tone may be occasionally childish, but the idea is the one that will bear fruit at Berlin in 1875.

To promote the education and emancipation of the Jews is the plan of the French Jews from 1791. Seventy years later it is the programme of the Alliance Israélite. Its germs are to be found in the writings of Isaac and Michel Ber. To regenerate men by moral and civic instruction was their aim, as it was that of the French Revolution to promote the freedom of their brethren wherever oppressed, and to oppose, forcibly if necessary, the tyranny of certain governments: this was their ideal, and this was also the intervention policy of the Revolution. Hence the founders of the Alliance were right in appealing to the principles of 1789 in their " Appeal to all Jews." The Alliance represents the union of emancipated Jews, on behalf of Jews not yet emancipated. The old Jewish spirit of national solidarity, which had made them charitable to one another in times of trouble, bound them together in prosperity. Moreover, being firmly convinced that by promoting the emancipation of their co-religionists they were developing the forces of civilisation, how could they remain inactive? That thought gave birth to the Alliance Israélite Universelle. The Alliance is the child of the Revolution.

III

The Revolution had theoretically emancipated the Jews. It remained to translate the principle into practice, to familiarise the Jews with the new régime, and the French people with a liberated Jewry. Napoleon had performed a twofold work. He had called together an assembly of representative Jews, who had issued an authentic statement of Jewish laws in their relation to State and society: further, he had officially recognised their religion, and organised it on a new basis. He had made a kind of Concordat with Judaism. The Assembly of "Notables" in 1806 and the Sanhedrin in 1807 made known to the world, what was unknown or ignored previously, that polygamy was forbidden by Jewish law, that marriage and divorce among Jews conform with the laws of the land, that in social relations Jews consider their fellow-citizens as brothers, and that they are loyal to their country. The various decisions of the Sanhedrin were sanctioned by the Government, and considered authentic. Abroad they were received with enthusiasm by Jews in all countries not opposed to Napoleon, whom some regarded as a kind of Messiah. The Senate of Hamburg appealed to these decisions in 1815, the Haham Isaac Bernays in 1843, and also the Synod of German Rabbis in 1844. Indeed, the Responsa of the Assembly and of the Sanhedrin were indispensable to proper organisation and recognition of the Jewish religion. We may not appreciate this to-day, when we have become accustomed to the toleration of all religions. But when we remember that Judaism, which had been ignored and despised until then, became not merely tolerated, but officially recognised and protected by the Government, the progress made is manifest.

IV

The years that followed were not as brilliant as those early years. The Jews of France had gradually to become accustomed to the new order of things. Yet the progress is slow but sure. In 1831 the salaries of ministers of the Jewish religion begin to be paid by the State; French Jewry emerges from obscurity; several Jewish journals are established; Jews distinguish themselves in the Army, the law, and the Civil Service: some even enter Parliament. The Government of Louis Philippe defends the rights of the Jews; in 1835 it suspends relations with a Swiss Canton, which had treated a Jew unfairly; in 1841 the Chambre des Députés lends its weight to the petition of a Jew who had been expelled from Dresden. On that occasion Carnot declared "France is perhaps the only country where the title of Jew does not constitute an exceptional position. France and Holland are the only lands where Jews enjoy full civil and political rights." The unfortunate and ungenerous attitude of the French Government in 1840, at the time of the Damascus accusation, served to reveal the change in public opinion towards the Jews. Nowhere, except perhaps in England, was there livelier sympathy, keener indignation than in Paris. Then was revealed the solidarity of emancipated Jewry in favour of their oppressed brethren. Two French Jews, Crémieux and Munk, and an English Jew, Montefiore, undertook the famous voyage to Egypt and Syria, which resulted in the release of the accused, and the founding of modern schools in these benighted lands. On his way home Crémieux was received with enthusiasm by the Jews of Austria and Germany. This was the psychological moment: the Alliance had now virtually come into existence.

V

Twenty years, however, were required to realise the project. The impulse of 1848, continuing the work of the Revolution, was needed. In the succeeding years French Jewry worked its way upwards. The programme of Isaac Ber had been put into practice and borne fruit; thanks to the schools and religious administration, the Jewish population had become healthier and stronger. The commercial prosperity of the Second Empire attracted Jews from other countries, and the Paris Community became one of the foremost in Europe. It attracted all the illustrious Jews who were hampered in Germany: Albert Cohn, the philanthropist; Munk, the orientalist; Oppert, the Assyriologist; Henri Weil, the Hellenist; Loewy, the astronomer. The heart, indeed, of Jewry might be elsewhere, the head was certainly there. Then it was that the French Jews awoke to the sense of their duty to their less fortunate co-religionists. In 1851, almost on the morrow of the Revolution of 1848, Carvallo, a Jewish engineer of Bordeaux, suggested an Assembly, a "Congress of the Jews." "What we stand in need of to-day is solidarity. Not, indeed, solidarity of hearts—each of us feels deeply the tortures, the infamous and shameful treatment of our brethren in certain countries—but solidarity of action, that general union of all Jews which would enable us to exert all our moral force to help the suffering. . . . The Congress which I have in mind would have as its aim to emancipate Jews wherever they still bend under the yoke of moral serfdom; to protect, encourage, and help our religion; to take uniform measures to transform the poor Jews into useful, honest, intelligent, and productive citizens wherever freedom is granted them; to render them worthy of freedom wherever they lack it. . . ."

Carvallo, who was to be one of the founders of the Alliance, renewed his appeal in 1858. Another of the future founders, Isidore Cahen, succeeded in 1858 in uniting many Jews in the interests of their common protection. In February, 1860, another publicist, S. Bloch, took up the same idea, giving it the name which it finally assumed. The Mortara affair of 1858, when the son of a Bologna Jew was abducted by the Inquisition, rendered appeals more frequent and more insistent. The Jews felt themselves in danger in the heart of a civilised Europe, and the Jews of France were at that period the best qualified to speak in the name of religious liberty; in England they had only just been freed from a humiliating restriction on their citizenship; in America they were only partly emancipated.

Such were the circumstances and the times in which the Alliance came into existence. In the *Exposé,* dated June, 1860, the founders refer to its origin: "The period of investigation is ended, the time for deliberation is over; the moment has come for action, and all men, knowing what there is to be done, have but to agree to come to an understanding as to the best mode of realising their object and of founding the new institution."

Two great facts dominate the history of modern Jewry: first, the conquest of civil and political emancipation; and, secondly, the formation of great instruments of Jewish solidarity. The Alliance is the product of these two great movements. Jews had, first of all, to be emancipated, and then to intervene on behalf of the unemancipated. France was the starting-point of both these movements, and the leading part in them was played by the Jews of France.

M. Liber.

(*Translated by S. Landman.*)

The History of the Prayer-Book

The Jewish prayer-book is not merely a collection of prayers for Jews. It is a history as well; for on almost every page the strangely changing and ever-varying fortunes of our people have left their mark. Its origins are lost in antiquity; its known history begins fully two thousand years ago. And then, and since then, the ideals and aspirations of every period have recorded themselves in the national liturgy. Temple-service with priest and Levite, Messiah's expected advent, the hourly hope for the "Kingdom of Heaven," the Roman conquest, martyrdoms, crusades, the inquisition, civic emancipation, every one of these is reflected in the prayer-book—and faithfully reflected. For if there is one occasion on which pretence and parade will be laid on one side, and when the whole truth of the heart will lie unfolded, it is in prayer, whether individual or national.

There is a tendency that emerges with marked prominence as we take a retrospect of the growth and structure of the prayer-book: the willingness to add coupled with the repugnance to alter. We find, therefore, comparatively little change, but constant and successive accretion. The inquirer into the history of this subject is, therefore, much in the place of a geologist who sees layer below layer before him, going down to an almost fathomless depth, and who, from the nature and position of these strata, must reconstruct the past. Take the case of the long Grace after meals. It was once confined to the first paragraph: a simple recital of thanks for the food that sustains man and beast alike. This, in later times, is amplified by a thanksgiving for Israel's land, and with it the other national possessions, the Law and the religion. The succeeding blessing, by its very subject matter, shows that a momentous event has transpired in the interval. The prayer is for the rebuilding of Jerusalem.* The operation of the same process may be followed in the Amidah. The very language of the various sections betrays differences of age. And so it is throughout the prayer-book; and we may seriously doubt whether the vocabulary of the Kalirian piyut, in part consciously coined, and in part a heritage of the deposit of centuries of study and Midrashic lore, would be altogether intelligible to Nehemiah or Simon the Maccabee, if either of these worthies were miraculously transplanted into a modern synagogue on the Day of Atonement. Greek and Latin words appear in Hebrew clothing, and Aramaic passages abound. Indeed, Hebrew and Aramaic jostle one another in the same prayer, and sometimes even in the same sentence, as, for example, in the last sentence but one of the Kaddish.† "May there be abundant peace from heaven" is Aramaic; "and life for us and all Israel" is good Hebrew.

Nor, when we speak of the modern prayer-book, must we think of it as an entirely uniform and universally accepted compilation. To exclude the Karaites, whose ritual is totally different from our own, there are differences of *minhag*, particularly in the liturgy for the Holy Days, which are far from negligible. A cursory glance at the prayer-book of the Portuguese Jews will bear this out. There are differences, too, between the German and the Polish rituals, and subdivisions even of these. Italy, Greece, Persia, China, all show variations, even as differences will be noted everywhere in the pronunciation of the common language.

Speaking generally, nevertheless, the bulk of the week-day morning service is the same in every *minhag*. And, as this is the nucleus of the prayer-book, it may be convenient briefly to summarise the stages of its evolution, before proceeding to consider more detached features of interest.

---

* See Prof. Büchler in *J.Q.R.* XX, 798.

† Authorized Daily Prayer-Book, ed. Singer, p. 76.

Even in Temple times prayer must have occupied some part of the service. It is inconceivable that even in the remotest times of history the people should have rested satisfied with the performance of sacrifices and oblations. Indeed, we have recorded proof to the contrary. Quite apart from individual prayer in the Temple, such as that of Hannah, we still possess in the Bible the words of the recital to accompany the offering of first-fruits, and the words of the priest's blessing; whilst the Mishnah gives us the words of confession used by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement, together with the response of the assembly. Many of the Psalms are plainly liturgical. Nor can public prayer have been restricted to the Temple. In Psalm LXX. 8, we hear of "All the meeting-places of God in the land" that have been burnt by fire. Sacrifice was prohibited outside Jerusalem, and these meeting-places were, therefore, without doubt, synagogues, such as those referred to in later times by the writers of the Gospels. The principal prayer of the Jewish liturgy, the Amidah, was by some Rabbis regarded as a substitute for the sacrifices that were abolished with the destruction of the Temple. But that it is far older is, I think, proved beyond dispute by the passage in Daniel (VI. 10), where we read that "Daniel went into his house, and his windows being open in his chamber towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day and prayed and gave thanks before his God as he did aforetime." There are cogent reasons for believing the Book of Daniel to have been written at the time of the Maccabæan rising, and we arrive at the conclusion, not only that a prayer said thrice every day was then in vogue, but that it was believed to have been so for many generations before. This harmonises with the statement in the Talmud * that the men of the great Synagogue (i.e. from the time of Ezra) instituted Israel's prayers.

---

* Talmud Babli, *Berachoth*, 33*a*; and cf. Yerushalmi, *Berachoth*, 4*a*.

And if the obvious question be asked, why it is that we have no records of these early prayers, there is a sufficient answer. It was considered wrong to write down prayers. Jewish prayer-books are a comparatively late introduction. "They who write down blessings are as if they burnt the Law," is a saying quoted in the Talmud.*

The recital of the Shema' and the Amidah prayer are the two main foundations of the service. Probably the liturgical use of the Shema' goes back to the earlier date. It is said twice a day, whilst the Amidah is said thrice. Tradition also assigns an earlier date to its institution. Probably the first paragraph from Deuteronomy VI. 4–9 was first in use alone. It was well chosen. It would have been hard to find in the Law a better summing-up of the teaching of Judaism than in the first two sentences, expressing the unity and love of God, or of the character of Judaism than in the injunction to keep the faith alive in the home, and to carry it abroad—not as a thing of special occasions, but as an accompaniment of everyday life. The second paragraph from Deuteronomy XI. 13–21 was doubtless chosen to supplement and echo the first. Three of its verses near the end (*vv.* 18–20) are almost identical with verses in the preceding passage. The third passage, from Numbers XV. 37–41, was perhaps chosen to emphasise the importance of national deliverance. The Tsitsith are to be a token of this as well as of the commandments of the Law.

The ceremony of reciting the Shema' in the synagogue was denoted by the obscure phrase, פרס על שמע, "dividing upon the Shema'." There have been endless discussions as to the significance of this term, but Dr. Elbogen† has shown by a weighty body of evidence that it had reference to the mode of recital. The section was split up or divided between reader and congregation. A member was chosen on each occasion to lead the recital, which he did from memory, and he had to pause after stated words, so that the congregation might join in.

---

* T.B., *Sabbath*, 115*b*.

† *Studien der Geschichte des jüdischen Gottesdienstes*, pp. 11 sqq.

The Amidah, as we have already noticed, is a structure of many generations. The first three blessings and the last three appear to have been formulated at an earlier age than those that intervene. They are uniform for all occasions, for Sabbaths and Holy Days as well as for week-days. The intervening matter was, probably, long left to the spontaneous formulation of the individual. No doubt various prayers and blessings were gradually compiled, from which he would choose, and by a process of crystallisation these prayers became gradually solidified into statutory blessings. This process is so common and so potent a factor in the formation of our prayer-book, that it deserves some attention. Distinct traces are still left of this building-up. The eighteen blessings are now nineteen. We know of a time when they were not even eighteen. The blessing beginning "And for slanderers"* was one of the additions. So, probably, was the next one, "Towards the righteous." The succeeding blessing for the rebuilding of Jerusalem cannot have been composed until after the destruction. The following paragraph, "Speedily cause the offspring of David,"† was at one time combined with it, and the whole formed one blessing. It would appear, therefore, that, as was natural, the later additions were inserted each as an appendix after the earlier portions. The last of the intermediate blessings, "Hear our voice,"‡ was naturally reserved, by the nature of its subject matter, as a conclusion.

The intermediate blessings used on week-days were replaced by a suitable blessing on Sabbath and Holy Days. The Amidah for these occasions was much shorter. For one occasion, however, it was abnormally long. We read details of it in an interesting passage of the Mishnah,* where the service is described which is held on a special fast-day, or day of humiliation, such as was proclaimed when rain had not fallen for many days. The service is held in the open air, and an Ark of the Law is set up there. A venerable man delivers "depressing words"—by which, no doubt, a sermon is intended. The address began with "My brethren." Texts considered suitable were, "And God saw their works that they turned from their evil way"† and "Rend your hearts and not your garments."‡ The people then stand up for the Amidah, which is rehearsed to them by one of their number, who descends before the Ark to do so.§ His qualifications are not only that he should be accustomed to the recital, but that he should be old, and have sons, "and that his house should be empty, so that his heart may be perfect in prayer." In addition to the eighteen blessings of each day six others are added. The blessing is in each case preceded by a passage from Scripture, and by a few words of prayer.

---

* Singer, p. 48. † Singer, p. 49. ‡ Singer, p. 49.

Thus the first blessing is introduced by passages from Scripture concerning Divine Remembrance, verses such as those which were collected for the New Year Additional Service, and which we still retain.||

Prayer: "He who answered our ancestors by the Red Sea, may He answer you and hear the voice of your cry this day."

Blessing: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who rememberest the things forgotten."

The second blessing is similarly introduced by scriptural verses concerning the shophar,¶ which was sounded at intervals by the priests.

Prayer: "He who answered Joshua in Gilgal, may He answer you and hear the voice of your cry this day."

Blessing: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearkenest to the shophar-blast."

---

* *Taanith*, 2, i. † Jonah III. 10. ‡ Joel II. 13.

§ For the meaning of this phrase see Elbogen, pp. 33 sqq.

|| Singer, p. 250. ¶ cf. New Year Service, Singer, p. 252.

The scriptural portions of the other blessings consisted of Psalms, all of them appropriate to the occasion, viz. Psalm cxx., "In my distress I cried unto the Lord"; cxxx., "Out of the depths have I cried"; cxxi., "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills"; cii., "A prayer of the afflicted."

Having thus touched upon the Shema' and the Amidah, the two pillars of the fabric of the liturgy, it will be of interest to turn to a passage in the Mishnah,* where an account is given of the service in the Temple held by the "ward" or "rota" on duty. It consisted of four parts:

(*a*) A blessing (without doubt the prayer "With abounding love") †;

(*b*) The Ten Commandments;

(*c*) The three paragraphs of the Shema';

(*d*) Three blessings, viz., "True and firm," "Concerning the Service," and "The priestly blessing."

The second and third parts, as passages of the Bible, call for no comment; but a few words of explanation may be given with regard to the two other sections.

(*a*) The first blessing, also called "The blessing over the Law," has been identified with the prayer, אהבה רבה. This has a counterpart, the prayer, "With everlasting love,"§ in the evening service. The theme of the blessing in each case is the Divine Love, and its manifestation to Israel through the giving of the Law. A further blessing was subsequently added and placed before it, its subject being thanksgiving for light. Similarly, in the evening service, a blessing was introduced, concerning the darkening of the twilight. But, whilst this latter blessing retained its original shape, the morning blessing was successively amplified until it reached its present abnormal size. It begins with the words, "Blessed art Thou . . . Who formest light and createst darkness,"[*] and continues till "Blessed art Thou . . . Creator of the luminaries."[†] A critical analysis reveals the process of accretion. Piyutanic embellishments, for instance, may be detected in the alphabetical passage, אל ברוך גדול דעה.[‡] Remnants of a similar acrostic exist in כלם אהובים כלם ברורים, etc. Scholars such as Rapoport and Zunz had attempted the reconstruction of the original blessing, and their conjectures have lately been substantiated in a remarkable manner by the discovery of certain fragments in the Genizah, at Cairo. These show conclusively that the original prayer was identical with a so-called contraction recommended by Saadyah.[§] It reads thus: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who formest light and createst darkness, who makest peace and createst all things,[‖] who in mercy givest light to the earth and to them that dwell thereon, whose goodness reneweth the creation every day continually, as it is said, 'To Him that made great lights; for His mercy endureth for ever.' Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Creator of the luminaries."

---

* *Tamid*, 5, i.

† Singer, p. 39.

‡ Singer, p. 42.

§ Singer, p. 96.

(*d*) The prayer, אמת ויציב, "True and firm," we still possess. The first paragraph is a kind of homiletical commentary on the first section of the Shema'. The last paragraph is, similarly, a commentary on the last portion of the Shema'. The blessing "Concerning the Service" is probably the sixteenth blessing of the Amidah in its pre-destruction form, "Whom alone we serve in awe"; [¶] the priestly blessing is probably the eighteenth blessing of the Amidah,[**] incorporating the Aaronic benediction.[††] It is conceivable that in these two blessings we have the nucleus of the whole Amidah.

(*To be concluded.*)

HERBERT M. ADLER

---

[*] Singer, p. 37. [†] Singer, p. 39. [‡] Singer, p. 38.

[§] Elbogen, p. 21.

[‖] A conscious euphemism for "evil." See Isaiah XLV. 7.

[¶] Still used when the priest's blessing is said.

[**] Singer, p. 53. [††] Numbers VI. 24–27.

The Talmud Student

(Hamathmid, the Diligent One)

From the Hebrew verse of Byàlik *

Still, in some hidden towns of our Dispersion,
There smoulders on, concealed, our ancient light,
In cities where our God a remnant spared,
As 'twere a hissing coal amid the ashes,
Where, like a plucked-out fire-brand, faintly smoke
Weak human lives, poor souls of small account,
Who live without a life and early wither
Like blades of grass upon a thirsty land.
And sometimes, when you walk abroad by night,
In some such little city blest, while stars
Twinkle above your head, and all around
The grasses whisper and the winds tell tales—
You hear the distant murmur of a voice,
And see behind a pane a distant gleam,
And then a figure like a corpse's shade,
That rocks and wavers, bending up and down,
With moaning chant—a rush of broken thoughts
Is borne to you upon the waves of silence.
A Talmud Student, prisoned in a Kläus
And keeping nightly vigil, you behold.

. . . . .

Within those walls, not one day, but six years,
Have watched his toil—his childhood ripened there
Too soon, his youth matured there ere its time,
His eyes were darkened and his face grew white.
Not one day, but six years, have passed since first
He turned him to the wall in that dark spot.
No sunshine has he looked on, only cobwebs,
Only the wall, daubed with untempered clay.
Hunger, and vigils, leanness and decay—
What are they, that his mind should dwell on these ?

---

* The translator gratefully acknowledges the copious and invaluable help of many kind friends, and specially of Mr. F. Hieger.

He surely knows, how students lived of old,
He surely knows, his day of fame will come.

. . . . .

Time, in six years, visits with news of change
Even that stagnant quagmire, a Yeshìbah!
Its children too have longing human hearts
And dance upon two feast-days in the year.
The building's very walls rock in the wind,
And benches go and, mended, they return,
And students leave and other students come.
Some go to spend the Solemn Days at home,
Some spread to neighbouring villages and there,
Delivered from the dread Superior's eye,
Disport themselves beneath the kindly roof,
Where pride and pity wait such learned guests.
And some have been expelled and leave in haste
And sadly to their fathers these return.
But one remains, stuck faster than a nail!
Events and years pass him behind—unseen
Before him there is nought, save evermore
The same blank wall, his corner and his books.

. . . . .

Since first he took his place there, no recluse,
No scholar yet, has seen him come or go.
The Shamash even has not fixed the time
At which he comes, at which he makes for home.
The morning star, the moon, the gloom of night,
They only know his hours, for e'en the sun
Knows nothing of his ways, nor e'er beheld.
And early, early, ere one may define
'Twixt bluish thread and white, " 'twixt wolf and dog,"
And when from out the soundless depths of night
The latter stars in mustered myriads shine,
What time the townsfolk sleep their closing sleep,
Before a cock-crow even breaks their rest,
Ere even those most pious Jews arise,
The last watch who forestall, to serve the Lord,
When all creation speechlessly awaits
The rising to new life, as though it dreamed
Its closing dream and hid beneath its wings
Secrets and charms, the while its sleeping face
Is veiled in silence, all emotion hid

Beneath the dusky folds, the "Mathmid" wakes
And straightway rises from a brief repose,
And dresses in the dark and seeks his corner.
The roving winds alone have heard his step,
His hasty step along the garden path
That leads to the Yeshîbah, while above
The stars keep sentinel along the way.

. . . . .

Then it may happen, that the frolic wind
That blows light-hearted out of heaven's blue,
Tempts him with Satan's blandishments, uncurls
His earlocks, whispers, fills his head with fancies.
The young man's eyelids cling and seem to beg:
"Have pity, brother, on your two dim eyes
That spoil beneath us! we are tired, have spent
Ourselves for thee, for thou hast made us toil
All day, a summer's day! and then throughout
A night-watch—brother, we are done to death!
Turn back, lie down, rest, and let *us* rest too,
E'en ere thou sleepest, we shall be renewed."—
But suddenly he passes his thin hands
Across the clinging lids, as though to brush
Such thoughts away, and down the empty street
Resounds once more the echo of his tread.
Then the wind lights upon the garden grass,
Whispers, entices with its murmuring sound:
"Behold, fair youth, how verdant is my bed.
Enjoy, before thy breath dissolve away!"—
"We also sleep," the grasses and the herbs
Lisp dreaming round him, and the stars above
Take up the tale: "We sleep—with open eyes."
And from the pleasant hay-fields comes a scent
That steals into his nostrils, makes him drunk.
A wave of air comes flooding to his lips,
Enters—a lightness fills his throat and breast,
He opes his mouth, inhales the air, makes loose
The shirt unfastened round about his neck,
Like some poor quarryman distraught with toil,
His inmost being begs and prays for rest.
He stretches to the wind his helpless hands
As crying: "Take me, carry me away!
Hence let us flee and we shall both find rest.

Here I am cramped for room, and I am tired!"
But sudden contact with the garden edge
Tells him his feet have strayed and he recalls
His duty and his corner, and as one
Who flees from sin, he hastes to the Yeshîbah. . . .

Within, a holy stillness fills the space
Empty as yet, and he first drinks it in.
His comrades three await him in his place,
They, who have been his friends since first he came:
The burning light, the desk, his book of tasks.
He hastes to join them, like to one who hoards
The nimble seconds, and begins to learn.
Once at his desk—the nail is hammered in!
All day and half the night he'll stay, and there
For very hunger, swallow his black bread.
O flint and iron! when the Jewish boy
Has taken to the Torah, where are you?

. . . . .

And thus the youth keeps steadfast to his seat
From break of morn till midnight, for his day
Has four divisions, whereof only one
Is for himself, while three are for the TORAH.
As one alone, cut off from friends, and tied
Fast to his corner, white-faced, wrinkle-browed,
A lifelong captive of his own accord,
On the Gemara still he shapes his soul.

. . . . .

"*Oi, oi!*" the Rabbis taught: ". . . if I shall offer
Body and life upon the Torah's altar,
I shall be heard, maybe, from out my corner,
And see my fame shine forth across the land. . . ."
"*Oi, oi!*" the Rabbis taught: ". . . Rabbi Akiba
Was simple and unlettered forty years,
Then entered a Yeshîbah and became
A glory of his folk, and I—am young!
My God, take what Thou wilt, my flesh and blood!
I've sworn by Thee and by Thy holy Law
My lips shall move, my voice shall cry, I will not
Stir from my place, my corner, and my heart
Shall know no rest, my eyes no sleep, until
Thy word has quenched my thirst, the Morning Star

Shall wake me, midnight lull me, till I know
The Talmud and am learned in the Torah ! ”
So, once more : Raba said . . . the Student’s voice
Borne by a strength sublime, rings out anew. . . .
Methought that high above the Ark there shone
A transient gleam, as though a Saint should smile.
The Holy Presence in the Scholar’s breath
*Delights . . . or else, she mocks the sacrifice
Of buried lives, that in a narrow prison
Deny themselves, heroic, for her sake ? . . .
And now the sun has sunk into the night,
The light above the Ark is upward caught,
And voices fall yet lower, till they seem
More like the hum of bees, the buzz of flies. . . .
At last the Shamash comes, and calls to prayer. . .

. . . . .

Minchah is quickly ended, and the lads
Disperse into the street, they seek the fields.
The youthful limbs, youthful in name alone,
Cry out, they seek the valley, wherein grow
The ruddy apples and the ruddier maids.
The heart o’erflows with joy, the lungs expand,
The wind is low and cools with gentle touch,
And dries the sweat from creased and saddened brow.
Within is silence, the Yeshibah’s walls
Are sunk in gloom and stillness, and of all
Her scholars, only two recluses pale
Remain behind to talk of trivial things.
And now, a voice has broken forth again,
A turtle-dove coos loudly in his corner. . . .
What is the sore heart crying now ? And what
The burden of his melancholy strain ?
Maybe he now recalls his dear, good mother,
His needy father, pines and feels the heart
Throb like a captive bird within his breast
For longing to behold their face again,
As day by day, afar, they in their prayers
Repeat his name, and hope for him and wait
As for Messiah, till he come indeed
The Torah’s diadem about his brow. . .
The wrestlings of a boy’s heart who can tell ?

---

* Refers to a sentence in the Talmud.

But ever, when the pious pass that way,
And bend an ear and stand, the while his voice
Pierces the severing wall with ringing tones—
The old ones linger and commend his choice,
And pray within their heart a silent prayer:
"Happy the son who gives him to the Torah,
And happy those who nurtured such a son! . . ."

. . . . .

"*Oi, oi,*" said Raba: ". . . and thou hearest not,
Even in whispers, what the living voices
Are crying round thee, boy, their speech to thee
Is meaningless as thou wert deaf and dumb."
"*Oi, oi!*" said Raba: ". . . and the soul, that cries
Daily through thy hoarse throat against the wrong
Done to the budding of its manly strength,
The sapping of its youth, thou hearest not,
Stoppest thine ears and shuttest out its prayer,
Each needful craving crushing out for good,
Stifling the germ of every humblest wish,
Uprooting every flowerlike aspiration,
Till, tired at last with its own weary cry,
With thirst unquenched and unfulfilled desires,
It fall asleep, a starved and withered thing,
That never was beloved and never loved."

. . . . .

And those two eyes of thine, for seeing made,
That might have viewed the earth and all her wealth,
Are spent and darkened, have as yet seen nothing,
Have nothing wished to see, and fade already,
And spiderlike, along forsaken paths—
And shadowlike, among the dead, thou gropest. . . .
For what were they created all in vain,
And why in vain shall they be lost, these souls?

. . . . .

Sometimes the student wonders at himself,
Disgusted at his toil and seized with anger.
In winter, when the cold and tempest reign,
When heaven is like a smoke and earth is dull,
When faint, dark clouds trail weeping o'er the sky,
"Oh, that the sun would but light up her face
One little moment, if she would but make
A slender offering of pallid light!"

From somewhere a green lizard comes, to pitch
Her tent within the corner, where the gloom
Is doubled, and the chambers of his soul
Are filled with chill and trembling. Then the youth
Feels in himself despoiled, forgot, forsook,
Feels that his strength is weak and weary grown,
The flame that burnt within him nearly spent.
His voice is like the sighing of a soul
That droops to death, the moaning of a heart
Trampled upon like grass, that only heaves
With bitterness and Prayers of Supplication.
His recitation is a bitter plaint,
His voice, it weeps and urges and implores.
Art thou in love, dear child, with pain and grief ?
Unhappy boy, dost thou not know thy state ?

. . . . .

Unhappy ? why unhappy ? Who can prove
That man was born to comfort ? On what plea
Is he to quarrel with his wretched corner
Where he has standing-room ?
The Torah, wide and shining, still illumes
The dark, sad regions she has ever sought.
God's hand from out the darkness took and gave her,
A heritage of light, from age to age.
In caves, on roof-tops, sat our children, there
They learned by stealth, until from out the caves
Came guides to light our path and from the roofs
Descended Sages—this, because the Torah
Is fathomed only by a life of grief,
And by afflictions have we been sustained.
Why should the youth regret it, that to him
The earth and all its fullness is denied ?
Two whole Sedarim, ordered well and kept
Upon his lips—just think, two whole Sedarim !
The other students envy him, they have
A presage of his better days to be.
Two whole Sedarim—oh, how blest his lot !
And shall he not rejoice ? He holds already
The guerdon of his toil, by all around
The Mathmid and 'Ilui he is called.
The priestly brow bore but *one* golden plate,
The ruler wears *one* crown of finest gold,

One wreath beseems the hero and the poet,
While on our Student's head there shine two crowns!
The Mathmid's, the 'Ilui's, feet are both
High on the stairway of the Torah set,
But few steps higher the Geònim stand.
How many have been worthy of such fame?
And he hopes on, for still the bloom of hope
Has secretly refreshed his downcast spirit,
And compensation showed for stolen youth,
And knit the Student's heart to love his corner.
Like one who, sharpening iron, sways and bends
'Mid flying sparks, above the whirling stone,
So whetteth he his brain in yonder corner
Upon the stony problems of the Talmud.
On winter evenings, when, in likely mood,
With some dark passage wrestling he prevails
That wrought oppressive on his fevered brain,
He sees again the day that brings him home,
The Ordination safe within his pocket,
Authorities and Talmud in his head,
His fame there spread abroad, his parents' joy,
The envy of his comrades and his friends
Unto this day dissembled, and his name,
A lightning flash from Mir to Volozhìn
While he is blest and praised as a Gaòn.
He a Gaòn? The prophecies come true?
Well, then: said Raba . . . "*Oi, oi,*" Raba said. . .
"The more he dreams, the dearer to his heart
His narrow corner and the broad Gemara,
His toil and pain and hunger, and his voice
Breaks out with might—yet whence the bitter note,
The suffocated sigh that wrings the heart,
Hidden and twined in the Gemara song?
No one, but he who passes the Yeshìbah
At night, or in the stillness of the dawn,
Who sees the lighted window and who hears
The lonely voice, the waking Mathmid's chant,
That pours out low before the hidden spirit
All its sweet bitterness, its bitter sweetness . . .
He only knows with what a fiery dart
It wounds and rankles, that Gemara song!"

. . . . .

I also in my youth have heard these voices,
Have watched these toilers, seen the wrinkled brows,
The heavy eyes, the pallid face that seemed
To beg for mercy—and each look and line
Told me of stifled feeling, crushed-out sparks,
Each look and wrinkle stirred the best within me
And rent my heart and wrung my inmost soul . . .
But when I call to mind their voice, their voice,
That wails like that of wounded men forgotten,
Lord of the world! I cry within myself,
On what were all these lives, these powers spent?

. . . . .

My fate hath not so willed that I with you,
Unhappy ones, should lose myself—I parted
From out your company, transgressed for bread,
And walked and lost myself in other paths.
The times have changed, and far now from your border
My altar-stone is reared, my tent-pole set,
And still I think of you, each one, each one!
Your forms are with me, clinging to my heart,
Recalling still how vigorous the seed
Hidden within your luckless plot of ground,
And what the treasure which it might have brought
Had but a ray of sunlight warmed the soil,
What sheaves we might have reaped, had but a gust
Of generous air blown o'er you—had the road
Which leads toward the Torah, which we so
Neglected and despised, been cleared and plain!
How pitiful and bitter is your end!
Oh, woe is me for you, my hapless folk.
How parched the lot, and blasted how the portion,
Wherein *such* grain could moulder and decay!

Helena Frank.

A Study in Liturgical Poetry

דְּוַי הָסֵר

Few songs of our liturgy can claim a popularity equal to that attained by the little poem which forms the subject of this article. Its brevity and beauty both helped to preserve this "reshuth" for grace after the bridal meal, composed close upon a thousand years ago, while scores of various "reshuioth" by much later piyutanim have long since passed to oblivion. It is, in fact, from excessive popularity that this poem suffered. So familiarised did it become, that those for whose use it was intended took undue liberty with it, and remodelled it to suit their tastes and purposes, to the detriment of the beauty of form imparted to it by its author. The object of this article is to restore to this poem what may be taken to be its original form. The following is the wording of the דוי הסר as published in our prayer-books (see Singer's Prayer-Book, p. 300):

דְּוַי הָסֵר וְגַם חָרוֹן
וְאָז אִלֵּם בְּשִׁיר יָרוֹן
נְחֵנוּ בְּמַעְגְּלֵי צֶדֶק
שְׁעֵה בִּרְכַּת בְּנֵי יְשֻׁרוּן

It need hardly be pointed out that this is not one of the very numerous piyutim in which the language, both philologically and as far as poetical technicality is concerned, is treated—in the words of Ibn Esra (on Eccl. v. 1): "like an unfenced city." A mere glance reveals the fact that we have before us a piece of Spanish-Hebrew poetry, in which the style was purer and the art more perfect. It must, however, be remarked that the author of דוי הסר (whose name forms its acrostic) was the pioneer in this kind of Hebrew verse. It was Rabbi *Dunash ben Labrat*, the grammarian and poet of the tenth century, who first made the attempt to free the piyut from its characteristic enigma and to introduce to it the Arabic strict metre and perfect rhyme.

The recently discovered תשובות תלמידי מנחם contains fierce denunciations poured out upon Dunash by his contemporaries for "polluting the sacred tongue by the introduction of profane and foreign methods, which are bound to uproot and utterly destroy it." But, curiously enough, those very critics who scorned the idea of adapting Dunash's form of metrification as following "the example of one who has walked after vanity and has become vain," patterned their versified diatribes against him after his own fashion, "in order that he may not say in the haughtiness of his heart, 'Who is able to make use of this metre besides me!'" Dunash, to some extent with the help of his bitterest opponents, thus initiated the most glorious epoch of Neo-Hebraic poetry. In referring to our author, Zunz (*Literaturg.* 484), who traces four liturgical poems by him,* remarks: "Die drei letzgenanten (among which is the דוי הסר) haben gleiches Metrum." But as regards our poem, it is only the first two verses that justify this classification. There, as in the three other poems, the metre משקל יתד וישתי תנועות = | - - | - ⏑ | - - |:- ⏑, rendered popular by the favourite אדון עולם is intact. But it is obvious that in the third and fourth lines the metre is made defective respectively by the words במעגלי and ישרון, and, what is even more noticeable, the rhyme is altogether absent.

The author of the שערי תפלה restored at once rhyme and metre into the last verse by suggesting אהרן instead of ישרון; which, by the way, is quite consistent with the version given by a Venetian sixteenth-century edition of a סדר ברכות, apparently unknown to this liturgist. According to Dr. Baer (*Abodath Israel*, 563) the words בני אהרן should be accepted as the original reading, for "Dunash, being a Levite, applied them to himself." The writer would venture to commend this view on what seems a much better ground, namely, that the term "Children of Aaron" was intended to be applicable to the one who led the assembly in saying grace, it being assumed that he would be a Cohen. It is more than probable that in the days of our author the honour of saying grace was, in accordance with *Gittin*, 59*b*, invariably conferred upon the Cohen present. Both the רש״י and ר״נ (*Nedarim*, 62*b*) declare that "in saying grace the Cohen has preference over any man"; and, no doubt, many a learned Rabbi could apply to himself the declaration made by R. Pereida (*Megilah*, 28*b*), "Never in my life have I said grace before a Cohen." Indeed, the author of מגן אברהם is at a loss to account for the fact that this rule, which originates from a Mosaic precept (Deut. xxi. 5) is not adhered to at the present time. It is thus quite feasible that Dunash had the general מברך rather than himself in his mind when making use of the term בני אהרן.

---

* The *Machzor Vitry* (ed. Hurwitz), p. 178, brings one more to light.

Another improvement is effected by Dr. Baer in suggesting מעגלי without the ב,* in the third line; and a rather daring attempt at restoring the rhyme in the same line is made by R. Jacob Emdin, by adding to it the word וכשרון; which, however, hopelessly damages the metre. It is obvious that all the alterations made in the original poem were prompted by one and the same motive, viz. the craving for introducing Biblical phrases wherever any expression is suggestive of such a phrase.† It is therefore most likely that not only was the בְּ added to the original מעגלי for that purpose, but that the word צדק was subsequently foisted in, in order to make the phrase consistent with ינחני במעגלי צדק of Psalm xxiii. 3. The noun suggested by Emdin might therefore be inserted as a substitute for, rather than an addition to, the word צדק. If we incorporate the above corrections, the poem will assume the following form, and be freed from any technical faults:

דְּוַי | הָסֵר | וְגַם | חָרוֹן
וְאָז | אִלֵּם | בְּשִׁיר | יָרן
נְחֵ | נוּ מַעְ | גְּלֵי | כִּישְׁרוֹן
שְׁעֵה | בִרְכַת | בְּנֵי | אַהֲרן

A. Mishcon.

---

* The use of an unprefixed noun after the verb נחה has a Biblical parallel in נחני — בית (Gen. xxiv. 27).

† We thus find that in most of the modern prayer-books the metre of the יגדל is spoilt by adopting the words לקץ הימין from Daniel instead of the original לקץ ימין.

Reviews of Books

Cambridge Biblical Essays. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D.; pp. 556. Macmillan and Co. 12s. net.

If these essays are considered from the point of view of Jewish interests, then there is a great deal which might be said about nearly every one. It may perhaps be chance, but the order of the separate chapters is to a very large extent one of question and answer, or shall we rather say, of proposition and attack. And yet there is a distinct unity of purpose running through them all. Thus, in a way the first two essays supplement one another, howbeit they present opposing points of view. The first place is occupied by Prof. Bevan, who writes on "Historical Methods in the Old Testament." To summarise, Prof. Bevan pleads for more consideration of Arabic literature in dealing with the Jewish Scriptures. Lately we have heard a great deal about Assyriology. Scholars like Jeremias are inclined to reduce everything to Assyrian influence. "Panbabylonismus" is usurping too large a share in the system of exegesis pursued by some scholars. Prof. Bevan lays stress on the circumstance that such monumental evidence as we possess has come into our hands by chance. "An inscription which records some event of the greatest importance is not more likely to escape the ravages of time than an inscription which relates to wholly insignificant matters."

Thus our heritage from Assyria is the result of chance, not of deliberate selection. On the other hand, our knowledge of the Arabs is incomparably fuller. Prof. Bevan compares their literary and historical methods with those prevailing in Israel, and comes to the conclusion that "for the elucidation of the historical portions of the Old Testament, the comparative study of the two literatures is of inestimable value."

That Arab institutions are of a much later date is no insuperable obstacle, for they are notoriously liable to become stereotyped. Certain features are permanent and ineradicable. The Arabs, too, have a far larger share in the Semitic stock than the inhabitants of Mesopotamia. Most scholars now reject the view that the primitive home of the Semites lay in some south-western portion of Central Asia in favour of Arabia and the "Abgelagerten Araberschichten" theory, and thus geographical reasons also would support Prof. Bevan's opinion. It is greatly to be desired that these opinions should be more generally adopted.

The second essay, by Dr. Johns, puts forward the Assyrian point of view. His temperate methods and claims stand in marked contrast to the exaggeration in which so many Assyriologists indulge. He examines the Creation and Flood epics and confines himself to clear cases of Assyrian influence. Dr. Johns also discusses the problem of how far the priority of Babylonian records affects the validity of the Hebrew accounts. For us Jews the question turns, of course, on our definition of inspiration. "If the use of uninspired language in a new connection with fresh meaning is sufficient, the most orthodox need be as little concerned by most of the assertions of dependence as are the admirers of Shakespeare when the possible sources of his plays are discovered."

The third essay, by Mr. S. A. Cook ("The Present State of Old Testament Research"), and the fourth essay by Prof. Kennett ("History of the Jewish Church from Nebuchadnezzar to Alexander the Great") are both written for the specialist, not for the lay student. Both of these scholars stand in the van of modern Biblical scholarship and a thorough technical knowledge is necessary before their efforts may be appreciated. For this reason a discussion of their theories is out of place in these pages.

The fifth essay deals with the "Interpretation of the Psalms" (Prof. Barnes). This is of extreme interest to Jewish readers. The cardinal principle laid down is that history *alone* cannot be the method of interpretation. Critics like Duhm go to extremes by placing inordinate stress on the historical background; as a matter of fact, very few Psalms have a definite historical background, and even then its recovery is almost impossible.

It is, of course, in the essay of Mr. Israel Abrahams ("Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis") that our interest culminates. Mr. Abrahams is always moderate in his postulates: his facts are so chosen and arrayed as to carry conviction, and the result of this self-restraint is that the thoughtful reader is led to carry the conclusions to a further stage on his own initiative.

Rabbinic exegesis is valuable for the Old Testament, because, apart from all other considerations, it assists us frequently in recovering the original text of Scripture. Several conclusive instances are supplied. For the New Testament it is valuable because it gives us not merely the literary and historical background, but because it supplies "the exegesis of ideas as distinct from the meanings of words." Finally, Mr. Abrahams turns to questions of date. One of the chief arguments of those who oppose the use of Rabbinic evidences used to be based on the supposition that they were later than the Gospel narratives. The absence of any foundation for such an idea is clearly demonstrated.

Of the other chapters of the book, space precludes any notice in detail. They deal chiefly with subjects of Christian interest, but Prof. Burkitt's essay should be read by Jews with profit and interest. Altogether the book is one which requires and deserves careful study: it is eminently suitable for Jewish discussion societies.

The Samaritan Liturgy. Edited by A. E. Cowley, in two volumes. pp. c–879. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1909. £3 3*s*.

THE publication of this book marks a turning point in the study of Samaritan. Since my discovery of the Book of Joshua, general attention has again been directed to the small sect in Nablus, and the present issue of the *Samaritan Liturgy* comes at a psychological moment. These prayers and hymns are the most genuine product of Samaritan piety ; they reflect most faithfully the inner workings of their mind. Before God men will not easily attempt to hide their innermost thoughts, and when they approach God with supplication or thanksgiving, as the occasion may demand, the expression wells up from the inner consciousness and from trusting faith. It is, therefore, a great service which Dr. Cowley is rendering to the history of religion and to Samaritan philology and theology by this publication. He has now for the first time given us the complete collection, not as has hitherto been the case with Gesenius and Heidenheim, detached portions torn out of their setting and from the liturgical context. It is the whole "Mahazor," if I may borrow the term from the Jewish liturgy, and each service complete in itself. The whole of the text, which in the original fills twelve volumes, making a total of close upon 12–1500 pages, has been transcribed from the ancient script of the Samaritans into the modern Jewish square alphabet. There are, perhaps, few who would be able to read fluently that old script, and who knows whether the expenses involved in the production of this volume of 879 closely printed pages in minute Hebrew letters would not have been a bar to the publication ? Personally I regret that the old alphabet has not been used. After all, the book is to appeal to specialists, and they must be able to refer to the originals, and probably also to the Arabic translation written in the same characters. It would also have materially assisted in explaining and correcting mistakes due to the similarity of letters. But this is a minor point. The fact is that at last a desideratum of many years' standing has been fulfilled by a competent scholar who has spent a long time on the copying and collating of not less than fifty MSS. in various libraries, notably those in the British Museum, the Crawford Collection—now in the John Rylands Library, Manchester—in Oxford, Paris, and Berlin. It was done in the spare hours of twenty years, and at long intervals, since the first pages were in print already in the time of the late Dr. Neubauer.

In a rather short introduction the editor describes the method which he followed, the MSS. which he used, the history of the liturgy on the lines of his article in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, a brief outline of Samaritan grammar, mostly as supplement to Petermann's short *Samaritan Grammar* (Leipzig, 1873), three chronological and genealogical lists of some of the principal authors of liturgical hymns, a much too brief glossary of the Aramaic texts (p.xlix–lxxii), an index of first lines, most valuable, nay, indispensable for the future student of Samaritan liturgical MSS., and last, not least, an index of authors, with the references to the pages where their hymns are to be found. All this is crowded into one hundred pages, and greatly enhances the usefulness of this edition of the liturgy. Before turning to the texts, it might be considered advisable if I sum up the results to which Dr. Cowley has arrived about the history of the Samaritan prayer-book. He distinguishes three periods. The first was the fourth century, when Aramaic, being the living language, was used in the liturgy. To that period belong Markah, Nana, and probably Amram Darah. The second, the tenth and eleventh centuries, when Aramaic was no longer the vernacular, but was still used in an artificial manner, and was mixed with Hebraisms. To this period belong such men as Ab Gelugah, Abu-l-hassan of Tyre, Joseph Harabban, Pinhas ben Joseph, etc. Finally, the third period from the fourteenth century and after, when Hebrew had become the liturgical language, mixed with Aramaisms. "And in the latter are found an increasing number of Arabic idioms and words, Hebrew (or Aramaic) words used in the Arabic sense, and even phrases adopted from the Qur'an." I am repeating merely the views of Dr. Cowley (p. xxxiv–xxxv) without thereby assenting to his conclusions, for surely the Samaritans must have had prayers before the fourth century, and the very history shows that prayers are not changed, only to the old new ones are added. To this period belongs, in the first place, the famous Abisha, Abdallah ben Solomon, Abraham Qabasi, of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and then, descending to our own times, we find the priestly family, the Danafis and the Marhibs, among the constant writers of hymns. One of the latest is Pinhas ben Isaac, who died in 1898, from whom nine or ten hymns are printed here.

The oldest prayer-book Dr. Cowley finds in the so-called Defter, the Samaritan name for which is "Kenosh," i.e. Gathering, Collection, of which a MS. in the Vatican has been preserved which is older than the fourteenth century. To this may be added the MS.

of the British Museum, also not later than the end of the thirteenth century. The Defter, according to Dr. Cowley, contains the oldest framework, and, in fact, the whole "Mahazor," Aramaic prayers and hymns going back to the fourth century. Within this framework enlargements took place at the intervals mentioned above, and thus the small prayer-book of the fourteenth century of 85 pages print has now been swollen to ten times the amount, 879 pages! A detailed description of the prayers and hymns will afford us a clearer insight into this *corpus liturgicum*, due to a tenacity of purpose and indomitable perseverance which cannot be sufficiently praised. The first volume begins with the common prayers or Defter, the prayers of Sabbaths and festivals. Then follows the Passover series, comprising hymns of the Sabbath, "Simmut ha-pesah," the new moon and Sabbath of the first month, the Sabbaths before Passover, Pessah evening and morning, the hymns on the "Diktas," i.e. on Mount Gerizim when they sacrifice the Paschal lamb, and those which they say in the "Kinsha," when they are prevented from going up the Mount. Then follow prayers for the Feast of the unleavened bread, which they distinguish from the Paschal service of the first night. Differing from this, though connected with it, is the Feast of the unleavened bread, which they keep strictly during seven days, for which they have a separate service for the evenings and mornings of the week days and the intervening Sabbath. Then the prayer for the seven Sabbaths of counting, from the first Sunday in Passover until Shebuoth; the prayers for the second Passover in the second month of the year; the prayer for the day of the Reading—the Service of the Commandments—the Feast of harvest on Mount Gerizim, for they still carry out the injunction of the pilgrimage to Mount Gerizim, which they consider to be the chosen place, and then the prayer in the "Kinsha," in town. The first volume concludes with the prayers for the Sabbath of the "Simmuth" of Succoth. The largest portion of Vol. II, pp. 443–715, is taken up with the prayers for the Feast of the seventh month, as they call our Rosh-ha-shanah. It is a comparatively brief service (to p. 468). Then follow prayers for the Ten Penitential Days, and exactly 225 pages are filled with hymns for the Day of Kippur. With the prayers for Succoth, Sabbath, and week days, on the Mount and in town, the cycle of festival prayers comes to an end. The eighth day counts as a separate festival, and has a complete set of prayers of its own. From p. 818–66 we have occasional prayers, for marriage, birth, circumcision, and for burial. In order to save space all repetitions are omitted. The directions or rubrics are printed in Arabic, and Dr. Cowley says about them, "The Arabic of the headings is the vulgar language used by the later Samaritans . . . the language is more than usually debased. They are very cursively written, often hard to read, and harder to explain. They are printed here with all mistakes, as in the MSS." (p. xlii). I have given a full and more detailed description of the contents than the author himself. The reason is obvious. Through such a detailed description of their religious cycle one can see that the Samaritans follow closely the Law of Moses and keep all the festivals and holy days prescribed by the Law, and in addition also services for the Sabbaths of "Simmuth." It is here not the place to discuss the meaning of these Sabbaths. Whichever way they arrange their Calendar, at any rate they are following the same injunctions as we do, and the question which some might ask, of what interest is that liturgy to the Jews, is thus practically answered. Here is an old sect, at least as old as the second Temple, with ancient Jewish traditions and their liturgy, that may help to throw light on the very obscure beginnings of the Jewish liturgy. The "Origines" are, in the best of circumstances, difficult to discover. Long after the stream has left the fountain head it becomes visible and assumes a character of its own. Not often is it possible to find the real source whence they spring. Herein lies to my mind the importance of this book for the student of Jewish liturgy. No doubt the religious views of the Samaritans, their theology and eschatology, are of great value for the history of many principles and practices among the Jews, showing, as they do, the greater antiquity of the latter than is generally accepted. The language is a welcome assistance in the solution of problems of Aramaic grammar and dictionary in our Targumim and in the Palestinian Talmud. But the liturgical aspect appears to me to be the paramount. And herein we have touched the weakest spot in this laborious publication. It must be remembered that the editor has given all the rubrics, i.e. directions for the service, in the debased Arabic of the later times, and he had to own that they are often "hard to read and harder to explain." The least one could have expected, then, was that he should have come to the assistance of the reader, who will look bewildered at these enigmatic headings. Surprising though it be, it is none the less a fact that he has not assisted us in any manner whatsoever to understand even the meaning of those directions which no doubt he has mastered. Throughout the whole book *not a single explanatory note* is to be found, not a word of guidance, nothing to make the crooked straight and the dark light. And, furthermore, why has he omitted the *Hebrew* rubrics which, besides, must be older than the Arabic, and are found in the very oldest MS. he used, the Defter of the Vatican, which is not later, if it be not earlier, than the fourteenth century! But also, in more recent copies of the Defter (Kenosh), judging by my own copies, Hebrew names for prayers and directions for service have been preserved. Disappointing as this is, it is by no means the worst defect which must considerably detract from the value and usefulness of the compilation. In the service of the Samaritans, as is to be expected, the Pentateuch forms the basis and the pivot round which everything turns. Not only is the Law read in Sabbathical pericopes, but from the text selections of verses are made which form the very centre of the prayers. The hymns are there only to introduce the reading or recitation of these "anthologies," as I should like to call the "Katef," and to mark the end of the readings from one book, and the beginning of the reading of the other of the five books. These "Katefs" have been arranged to suit different occasions, and e.g. all the verses referring to Sabbath are collected in five groups from the five books and read to the accompaniment of a "Markah" and a "Duran." Dr. Cowley has now omitted all the Katefs, evidently considering them of little value, and probably also for the sake of economy. No more unfortunate economy than this! We had rather dispensed with hymns of a Pinehas who died as late as 1898, than to have missed this most essential portion of the prayer-book, which, if any, must be the oldest of all. All the hymns turn round them; they lead up to them or take up the thread. And with the Katefs all the interjections, the interspersed verses and responses of the congregation, which joins in the reading and emphasises the contents, are gone too. The only safe guide and strong support in our comparison of the oldest form of the Jewish liturgy with the Samaritan has thus disappeared, and one regrets this omission the more when one compares with them also the Karaite prayer-book, in which exactly the same principle prevails, and in which the "Katef" forms the essential part of the prayer. The hymns are only accessory elements added and subtracted *ad libitum* and of secondary importance. The references in the rubrics are now hopelessly unintelligible. If the editor himself, with his unrivalled experience, found these directions "hard to explain," what awaits the inexperienced who would venture to utilise this edition and draw from it conclusions for the history of the liturgy. No less incomprehensible is the fact that though the Defter gave the directions for the services of the Feasts and Fasts (pp. 66–67), the editor should have thought it advisable to omit them. It is the more incomprehensible since, according to Dr. Cowley's statement, *this* Defter represents the whole of the old service up to the fourteenth century, and then the essential portion is omitted! It is a source of keen regret and deep disappointment that we should have here nothing more than a faithful and accurate transcript of the hymns only of the Samaritan liturgy, which moreover in their majority belong to the more recent authors. It is a lasting pity that the essential features of the Liturgy should have been omitted, and that no attempt should have been made to assist the reader in the understanding of the complicated directions and their difficult terminology. The original MSS. are thereby not superseded, and for all these details, as well as for the older portions, they, and the Arabic translation which accompanies them, will have to be consulted. Dr. Cowley has been more attracted by the philological aspect, and to this he has tried to do full justice. Of the philological aspect of the hymns, the nature of the collation, the completeness or lacunæ, and other points I shall deal elsewhere at greater length. It suffices to state that so far as he published them he has given us exact and carefully prepared transcripts, and has furnished scholars with a reliable basis for their studies of the language of the Samaritans, and of the doctrines embodied in their religious hymns. A comparison with Heidenheim shows the profound difference in accuracy between the two publications; and though greatly disappointing in many a direction, this publication is, through the vast amount of material collected here, without doubt the most valuable contribution to our knowledge of the literature of the "sons of Ephraim."

In conclusion, one question. Has the editor given up entirely his intention of publishing an English translation? This would, of course, greatly diminish the inconvenience caused by this bald transliteration of the texts. He has on many occasions hinted at such a translation, but in the book itself not a word is mentioned of it.

M. Gaster.

Philo-Judæus of Alexandria. By Norman Bentwich. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1910. 8vo.

THE Jewish spirit is at once mystic and legal. This is one of the many paradoxes in the character of our race, and the one which, perhaps, is most often overlooked. From Ezekiel downwards, the conception of the Law as a positive rule of human life has been in the greatest Jewish minds transfigured by the mystic imagination; and the absence of the latter has always been a sign of arrested development and an omen of decay. In his study of Philo Mr. Bentwich has done good service by demonstrating this characteristically Jewish combination of qualities in the spirit of the great Alexandrine, and by vindicating the claim of Philo to rank among the great teachers of Judaism.

At the end of the first century B.C. the rich Hellenistic culture and many-sided intellectual interests of Alexandria had deeply affected the Jewish community of that city. Still, for the most part, loyal to their nationality, their Law, and their traditional modes of religious worship and exposition, the Jews of Lower Egypt at the same time were actively interested in the cosmopolitan interchange of ideas, especially in those of Hellenistic thought, of which Alexandria was the chief centre. Speaking the Greek language and deeply imbued with Hellenistic modes of thinking, they were eager to prove that their Hebraic doctrine, interpreted in Greek terms, was the ideal for which Greek speculation had long been seeking, and which the whole civilised world was now ripe to accept for the final consummation of its ideals. A great spirit of conciliation and missionary zeal was stirring in the Jewry of Alexandria. It culminated, and ended, in Philo.

The desired point of contact between Hebraic and Hellenic thought was found by allegorical interpretation of the Bible in terms of Platonic idealism. Midrashic exposition was always congenial to the Jewish temperament, and in Alexandria it flourished mightily. There were doubtless earlier Darshanim there who gave a Platonic turn to their interpretation; but the greatest of all is Philo. Mr. Bentwich hardly exaggerates when he says that "Philo sums up for us the whole of the Alexandrian development of Judaism. He represents it worthily in both its main aspects: the infusion of Greek culture into the Jewish pursuit of righteousness, and the recommendation of Jewish monotheism and the Torah to the Greek world" (p. 77). He was inspired to his mission by a great conviction that Israel was "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," empowered by its possession of the revealed Law of Moses to convey the supremest truths of morality and philosophy to the world; and he endeavoured to fulfil this high office by his interpretation of the Torah, discovering in the allegorical fashion popular in Alexandria general ethical and metaphysical conceptions underlying its particular legal injunctions. He was thus "liberal in thought, conservative in practice"—liberal in the sense that he read beneath the letter of Scripture the conception of the common brotherhood of mankind in the service of their noblest ideals, conservative in that he refused to abandon the duty of observing the letter of scriptural prescription when he had realised its spirit. It is indeed characteristic of him that in his formulation of Halakhah he is generally stricter than the Rabbis of Palestine.

Thus Philo's is a fascinating and complex personality, at once Hebraic and Hellenic; and Mr. Bentwich, equipped with both Jewish and Greek learning and sympathies, is able to do justice to its worth and beauty. To some extent this is a pioneer work of its kind, for it is the first attempt by a Jew "to give a presentation of Philo from the Jewish standpoint," on the thesis "that Philo is essentially and splendidly a Jew, and that his thought is through and through Jewish" (p. 8). It is a skilful and well-written essay, and in our opinion it proves the main point of its thesis. But we must make one slight reservation; can it be strictly maintained that Philo's thought was *through and through* Jewish? In his higher metaphysical flights Philo occasionally reaches planes where Judaism cannot follow him. At the head of the virtues he sets the "intellectual love of God" in His ideal nature, as the Logos; and then, still unsatisfied, he supposes a still more exalted condition, a knowledge of the Deity in His own nature, such as he believes to have been attained by Moses. This view would be perfectly intelligible to a Hindu; but we doubt whether it could have been understood by the mere Jew, much less approved by him. To Rabbinical theologians, who like Philo identified the Torah with the Logos, it must have seemed a dangerous heresy to draw a practical distinction between God as revealed in His Will and God *in se*. Of course, we may now admit that Philo's extreme idealism was compatible with Judaism; so was the Aristotelianism of Maimuni, and so was the Kabbalah in its better days. But compatibility is not identity.

We are led to suspect that in Philo the fusion of Hebraism and Hellenism was imperfect. At heart, as in his practice, Philo was a pure Jew, and he realised that the basis of Judaism is a demand of faith, that man make God's will his will. The Will of a personal Deity, revealed in the Law and the Prophets, is the sanction of all moral and intellectual life; the service of that will by faith and works is man's highest condition of enlightenment and spiritual freedom. Because Philo heartily subscribed to this doctrine, he was thereby unable to be a true Platonist. The cardinal weakness of the Platonic system was that its hierarchy of ideas was based upon, and derived all validity from, an Idea of the Good which could not be defined or explained satisfactorily, and which ultimately is as much a postulate of dogma as the Hebrew God; and Plato shows his consciousness of this fact by his frequent lapses into the language of orthodox theism and mystical parable. If we have read him aright, Mr. Bentwich appears to think that Plato, by superimposing the Hebraic conception of a personal God revealed in Logos and Torah upon the Platonic system of Ideas, thereby filled the gap in the latter. In a sense this is true; Philo's doctrines contain much of what is noblest in both Jewish and Platonic thought. But is it a true harmony that he reaches? Despite his moral and religious intuitions, Plato is essentially an intellectualist of the perfect Hellenic spirit; his system was constructed without the assumption of a personal God, and only occasionally admits a *deus ex machina* to help him out of a difficulty. Hence it becomes extremely incongruous and unconvincing when it is re-edited by Philo, who places at its head a Supreme Deity at once transcendent and personal, equates the ideal world with the Logos and Torah, and then opposes all these to the realm of physical being. Philo, on the other hand, starts from the genuine Jewish standpoint; but in the warmth of his intellectual sympathy with Plato he is again and again led to desert this ground for flights of imagination which, as we have already remarked, lead him outside the Jewish sphere of thought.

Turning to another point, we cannot wholly agree with Mr. Bentwich when, in comparing Philo with the Arabic school of Jewish writers, he asserts that "they do not inherit his whole object, for they aimed not at a philosophical Judaism which should be a world-religion, but at a philosophical Judaism for the more enlightened Jews alone" (p. 197). True, they could not share Philo's expectation of a speedy acceptance of Judaism by the whole world; experience forbade this. But though the goal was farther from their eyes, they looked forward to it with no less intensity of desire and faith, and their spiritual sympathies embraced all mankind, as did Philo's. Of this the "Kether Malkhuth" is sufficient evidence. Nor were they limited to "a philosophical Judaism for the more enlightened Jews alone." They produced a large amount of writings in verse and prose which were purely devotional and didactic, and which, because of their exoteric nature as well as their beauty and vigour, were in many cases incorporated in the Sephardi ritual. They were never merely esoteric philosophers, cut off by their abstruse speculations from the outer world; on the contrary, they were the fine flower of a noble Jewish culture, which they in their turn helped to perpetuate. It would be juster to call Philo himself "esoteric," for he wrote his higher speculations for a narrow circle of initiates, as Mr. Bentwich admits (p. 90).

L. D. Barnett.

Revelation and Inspiration. By James Orr, M.A., D.D. pp. xii-224. London, Duckworth & Co.

The contribution which the author of *The Problem of the Old Testament* makes to Messrs. Duckworth's series of Studies in Theology is an endeavour to bring within the reach of all the light that modern learning throws on a fundamental problem of faith. The Jewish reader will, of course, be unable to follow Dr. Orr in his treatment of the Old Testament as an introduction to the New. Though they may ask the same questions, Jew and Christian do not address themselves to the same difficulties. Is there a divine Revelation? Is it contained in the Bible only? For the Christian, Revelation is primarily an unveiling of the divine nature. He is concerned chiefly with the knowledge of God as a way to individual salvation. For the Jew it is primarily a declaration of the divine will. He is concerned chiefly with the establishment of a kingdom of God on earth. Modern thought tends to eliminate the supernatural. It universalises Revelation, and finds elements of it in all historical religions. That tendency can cause the Jew little difficulty in its effect on Revelation as knowledge of God. On the other hand, in the fact that the only three Monotheistic religions, even now existent, trace their origin to Israel's Bible, we have life's witness to a special revelation through Israel. The Jewish reader who bears in mind the particular connotation that the word Revelation has for him will also realise that the special purpose of the Biblical revelation involves a distinction between genius and inspiration. He will then, from his own point of view, find much that is helpful in Dr. Orr's reconstructive work.

The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche. Edited by Dr. Oscar Levy. The Genealogy of Morals. Vol. XIII. Translated by Horace B. Samuel, M.A. T. and N. Foulis, 23 Bedford Street, W.C. 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. Levy is to be sincerely congratulated on the progress of his courageous enterprise in providing the English public with a complete translation of the works of Friedrich Nietzsche; and if this volume is a fair sample of the rest of the series, he is to be further congratulated upon the men he has associated in the work. Mr. Horace Samuel's translation of a book which is full of subtle analysis and pregnant aphorisms is extremely well done. There are places, indeed, where one is conscious of reading a translation, but there are others where the writing is as brilliant and impressive as pages of Carlyle; and throughout the book is readable and intelligible. To Jewish readers this work of Nietzsche (upon the genealogy of morals) has a special interest, since he elaborates in it with splendid, if perverse, eloquence one of his fundamental ideas, that it is the Jews who have established in the world, in place of the old and higher aristocratic idea that the good is the beautiful and the strong; the "morality of the slaves," which by a radical transvaluation ordained that the poor, the weak, the lowly should be regarded as the good. This "morality of the slaves," which Nietzsche ascribes to Jewish hatred and resentment against their Roman masters, was rather the Christian than the Jewish ideal, and the identification of the Jewish with the Christian standpoint is neither historically nor philosophically justifiable. As Nietzsche himself points out, in the chapter upon "The Ascetic Ideals," the Old Testament is something quite different from the New. "All honour to the Old Testament," he says. "I find therein great men, an heroic landscape, and one of the rarest phenomena in the world, the incomparable *naïveté* of the strong heart; further still, I find a people." Nietzsche is, indeed, a modern Balaam, and his biting analysis of the Christian ideal may be a tonic to some of those invalids in the Jewish community who seem no longer able to stand upon their own legs or to breathe the bracing air of their own Scriptures. If they are not willing to go to learn with the old teachers of their people, they may perhaps find a healthy stimulus in the most modern and the most incisive of latter-day ethical philosophers. And Nietzsche has found a congenial interpreter in Mr. Samuel, whose satiric pen, we doubt not, has eagerly leapt forth at each new prick of the bitter critic of Christianity.

The Law and the Prophets, or *The Revelation of Jehovah in Hebrew History, from the earliest times to the capture of Jerusalem by Titus*. By Professor Westphal, of Montabau. Translated and adapted by Clement du Pontet, M.A., with a foreword by The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Winchester. pp. xxviii–457. London : Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1910.

A BOOK recommended by Dr. Ryle, himself one of the strongest Old Testament teachers at Cambridge before he joined the Bishops' bench, is sure to render service to teachers. Its chronological tables and maps, and the great learning with which parallels are drawn from a wide range of literature, bring Biblical persons and teachings into strong relief by striking contrasts. Emphasis on the organic unity compensates somewhat for the author's acceptance of Higher Critical literary theories. The moral lessons drawn are given from the view-point of an upholder of the theory of Progressive Revelation, but the work bears the stamp of a conservative tendency which is particularly gratifying in its refutation of attempts to reduce Biblical characters and miracles to mere myths. The book will give genuine pleasure to its readers.

קול רנה. Hebrew Hymnal for School and Home. Edited by Lewis M. Isaacs and Mathilde S. Schechter. 59 pp. George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1910. 2s. 6d. net.

"The purpose of the Hebrew Hymnal is to present traditional melodies of the synagogue and the Jewish home, adapted to the needs of young Israel." The purpose has been admirably executed, and this little book ought to find its way into many a Jewish school and home. It contains nearly forty traditional songs or chants, which in each case are set in a simple musical score, and not only are the Hebrew words carefully and accurately transliterated, but the Hebrew itself is added. There is nothing better calculated to revive the love of the old Jewish service, both in the home and the synagogue, than the ability of the children to take part in the singing of the hymns and responses, and Mrs. Schechter and her collaborator, Mr. Isaacs, have deserved well of all who are eager for the retention of Hebrew in the ritual.

THE

JEWISH REVIE

ITED BY
RMAN BENTWICH
AND
DR JOSEPH HOCHMA

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes: Past and Future. The Russian Rabbinical Commission and Conference. Jewish Religious Education in London. Jewish Statistics PAGE 191

Judaism and the Gospels . . *Achad Ha'am* 203

The American Immigration Laws in their Relation to the Jews. . *Max J. Kohler, New York* 230

Jewish Philosophy of the Middle Ages. *M. Simon* 242

The History of the Prayer-book (*concluded*). *Herbert M. Adler* 253

Voltaire and the Jews . . *S. Landman* 261

The Ghetto Alms Collector—a poem *J. L. Perez* 274
Translated by *Helena Frank.*

Reviews of Books 276

Vol. I. No. 3.
September,
1910
PRICE 1/6 NET.
NDON:—GEO. ROUTLEDGE & SONS LD

Aspects of the Hebrew Genius.

Crown 8vo, Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

THE UNION OF JEWISH LITERARY SOCIETIES has much pleasure in bringing to your notice a new work entitled "ASPECTS OF THE HEBREW GENIUS," which has just been published for them. This volume consists of a series of Essays dealing with Jewish thought during the last two thousand years, viz. :—

1. **PHILO.** By NORMAN BENTWICH.
2. **SAADIAH.** By M. SIMON.
3. **MAIMONIDES.** By Rev. H. S. LEWIS.
4. **JEWISH CODES & CODIFIERS.** By Dr. S. DAICHES.
5. **ARISTOTLE & MEDIÆVAL JEWISH THOUGHT.** By Dr. A. WOLF.
6. **JEWISH MYSTICISM.** By H. SPERLING.
7. **THE JEWISH NEW LEARNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** By M. H. SEGAL.

The Introduction, by Mr. ELKAN N. ADLER, *President of the Union of Jewish Literary Societies*, forms a connecting link between the several Essays, and gives unity to the volume.

FOR HIGH CLASS

TYPEWRITING

MSS., Plays, Specifications,
Legal Copying, Correspondence,
etc. etc.

Shorthand, Duplicating, & Circularising

TRY

MISS COLEMAN,

SOLICITORS' AND GENERAL TYPEWRITING CO.,

68B Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.

Telephone: 3009 Holborn. *4 doors from Kingsway.*

The Jewish Review

AB. 5670. VOL. I. NO. 3. SEPTEMBER 1910

Edited by NORMAN BENTWICH AND DR. J. HOCHMAN

Consulting Committee:
ELKAN N. ADLER, DR. A. BÜCHLER, ASHER GINZBERG (ACHAD HA'AM),
MONSIEUR ISRAEL LÉVY, DR. L. MAGNES, DR. S. SCHECHTER

EDITORIAL NOTES

Past and Future

HISTORY never quite repeats itself, but its resultant progress is along a direct line. Hence the past is a prophecy of the future; and, were it not so, the present would be but a maze. The Ninth of Ab, the last historical celebration in the religious year 5670, has passed, and the solemn days of our High Festivals are approaching. The Fast that commemorates the repeated calamity of our national life also heralds the days when we are bidden "rejoice in trembling," as we recall that our people's purpose survives our people's fall—that our hopes remain, yet to be realised. This order in our festive calendar reflects, from past to future, the moving spirit of our history, directed through degradation to regeneration. It warns us that the present is of least account, and should renew our optimism. When the Romans conquered Judea the Jewish schools saved Judaism. The Romans thought that the destruction of the Temple meant the extinction of Judaism; but, in fact, they had sounded the knell of paganism. The consciousness of the reality of their religion gave our people confidence in the effective power of its influence. By this consciousness and confidence our existence is conditioned, and only when they are weakened is there danger to both Jews and Judaism. If we place any other object of activity before our religious interests, we reject the teaching of the past in our work for the future, and are like to become more entangled in the maze of the present. Concentration on the material welfare of Jews can but hasten our degeneration. At the last turn of the centuries it caused extensive conversion to Christianity among Jews grown impatient of the delays in the progress towards freedom. Now too we have some six or seven international Jewish organisations, working with a capital of ten or more millions, to improve the outward conditions of Jewish existence; yet, not only are those conditions no better, but, under continued persecution, the rising generation of Jews in Russia is no longer willing to play the rôle of martyrs, and impatient of the proved impotence of Jewish workers to achieve immediate results, they are deserting to the Church in alarmingly increasing numbers. In America, on the other hand, where also Jews congregate in large numbers, but enjoy full freedom of opportunity, the result of concentration on outward freedom is that Judaism is becoming dejudaised. There is, however, welcome evidence that the degeneration once again heralds our regeneration. Even as our Calendar counts its days from nightfall, so our conquests are begun when we are ourselves defeated! Jews are beginning everywhere to realise that their salvation depends less on social or political than on religious activity. German Jewry is engaged in anxious consideration of the possibility of closer union between liberal and observant Jews. In France the separation of Church and State has roused the Jews to a deeper sense of their responsibility, and the effort is being made to organise in each congregation a "*Société Israelite des amis de l'instruction réligieuse*" to overcome the indifference of parents, and win their co-operation in the provision of systematised religious instruction for their children. In America, while one Rabbi has resigned his post to establish a "non-sectarian" congregation because he finds his

Reform congregation still too Jewish, another has resigned his post because he finds it not Jewish enough, and is devoting his energies to create for New York a Kehillah, which shall give to Jewish religious life and Jewish education in New York greater extension, elasticity, and unity. Anglo-Jewry is becoming conscious of the same needs, and reorganising its institutions to meet them. What the Kehillah strives to do for New York, the Rabbinical Commission seeks to achieve in the interests of the Jews of Russia. Both endeavour to create, on the firm basis of Jewish law, an organised Jewish society including all parties, within which Jewish Religious Education shall be the chief activity. Jewish interest centres once again in Judaism, and the consideration of the present pales before the care for the future.

The Russian Rabbinical Commission and Conference

The Russian Rabbinical Commission is an institution unparalleled in any other Jewry. It is a Government institution which traces its origin to Nicolas I, who formed a commission of seven Rabbis. The Jewish communities appoint electors to choose the commissioners, whose main function is to decide the application of Jewish law as affected by the results of governmental administration. Thus, in 1893, it was engaged on the problem of dissolution of marriage ties of men condemned to penal servitude in Siberia. At present it is concerned with the application of Jewish marriage laws to the large number of women who, in consequence of the great Jewish emigration, have lost trace of their husbands. The Commission has no permanent standing. Its sittings last about two months, and it is elected when summoned, generally once in fifteen years. Those of its decisions which receive the confirmation of the Russian

Ministry of the Interior are binding on all Russian Jews. The orthodox Rabbis being generally unacquainted with social and political affairs, as also with the Russian language, prominent laymen were allowed to take their place, so that the Rabbinical Commission became void of Rabbis till three were added in an advisory capacity. Concurrently with the Rabbinical Commission, which met at St. Petersburg recently, a conference of Rabbis and laymen was held under the presidency of Baron Günsberg, on whom M. Stolypin, the Russian Premier, relied for keeping the Conference from political discussions; and the mere attempt to discuss whether a protest should be lodged in the name of the Conference against certain animadversions in the Duma, was met with his threat of immediate dissolution.

A preliminary conference had been held at Kowno, and hopes ran high for the possibility of bringing about the union of Russian Jewry in one communal organisation for internal administration of Jewish affairs and for external relations with the Government. The three chief subjects to which the Conference set itself were concerned with the double Rabbinate, questions of ritual and communal organisation. The representative of the Ministry who watched the proceedings informed the Conference that his Government recognised only Jewish congregations for purposes of public worship, but no Jewish community, and that all points concerning communal organisation must be removed from the agenda.

The scope of its activities and possibilities was thus considerably limited; but the Conference sought to move forward as far as possible, and carried a proposition for the abolition of the office of Crown Rabbi, which is an official administrative post, and demanded Government recognition of the Rabbis, who are the real spiritual heads of communities, and now include men of modern culture. M. Stolypin, while promising to give the proposal his consideration, uttered the significant reminder that the Government had hitherto only recognised the Crown Rabbis, while the others were merely tolerated. Though the members of the Conference were not pledged to secrecy, Press representatives were excluded from its sittings, and it is consequently difficult to judge of its proceedings; but it is clear that there were wide religious differences, with extremes of orthodoxy and reform among its members, so that the proposal to found a modern Rabbinical Seminary had to be withdrawn. There was also a strong desire for communal organisation on another basis than the synagogue. The Government's tax on meat and candles used by Jews, which is intended to meet the cost of maintaining Jewish institutions, would form a basis for the popular control of any centralised organisation, which control would win it salvation from the power of wealthy assimilative Jews. It was, indeed, hoped to discover some fairer basis of taxation than the present impositions, which fall heavily on the poor and do not touch the nonobservant; but nothing seems to have been effected in this direction. The main objects which the Conference left the seven members of the Rabbinical Commission to win from the Russian Government were the abolition of the office of Crown Rabbi and of laws that hinder the proper development of Jewish educational institutions. Little, however, is to be hoped for from the Government, which, in spite of Jewish protest, is about to enforce the laws of compulsory rest on Sunday.

In a recent article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu points out that if the Russian legislation concerning Jews were restored to the condition in which it was in the first years of Alexander III, before Ignatieff discovered that to crush the revolution it was only necessary to make a scapegoat of the Jew, the retrogression would mark a considerable advance in tolerance. Should that reform be realised and the Government sanction a communal organisation of

Russian Jewry, the very existence of an external compelling power in the shape of the special laws concerning Jews and the peculiar relations of the Rabbinical Commission to the Ministry of the Interior, by which its decisions are rendered binding on all Russian Jews, will enable good to come out of evil. Russian Jewry would provide an example of a community united for all communal purposes on a religious basis despite religious differences. It is something that endeavours are being made to unite the Jewish communities of Russia in one body that shall include Conservatives and Liberals alike; and the aspirations that agitate Russian Jewry at least suggest the possibility of a united organisation with a system of voluntary taxation based on the requirements of observant Jews.

Jewish Religious Education in London

No part of the Report of the New York Kehillah is more interesting than that which deals with the organisation of Jewish Education. What the Kehillah stands for in its educational as well as its other activities is the recognition of the unity of the Jewish population of the whole city of New York, and the breaking down of the unmeaning and mischievous barriers which were being set up between up-town and down-town Jews. Its aim is to secure the establishment of a co-ordinated educational system, under one educational board, for the one million Jewish inhabitants who are concentrated in the city and its suburbs; and it has already taken the first step towards that end by the foundation of a teachers' college, which is equipping teachers of Hebrew and religion with modern methods, and of a bureau which is working to standardise the various schools. The New York Kehillah is faced with the problem of a child population of about a quarter of a million, of whom not more than a third, it is calculated, is receiving regular religious instruction. In London we are faced with the smaller and more manageable problem of a child population of some thirty-five thousand, of whom, it is estimated, two-thirds are at present receiving some teaching, in addition to what they may have from their parents.

As in other parts of the organisation of the community, our educational provision has failed to keep pace with the growth and development of the Jewish population. Originally the community provided schools for all Jewish children who were in need of free education; and in these schools Hebrew and religious instruction held an important place in the curriculum. But for twenty-eight years after the passing of the Education Act thousands of Jewish children were allowed to attend the Board Schools and receive "simple Bible teaching," or nothing at all in the way of ordered religious education; and when the conscience of the community was roused to the dangers of the growth of a godless generation in the East End, it was only moved so far as to provide, through the Jewish Religious Education Board, a minimum of Jewish teaching which could not satisfy the parents who cared for their sons' Judaism, and therefore failed to win either their financial or their moral support. Hence side by side with the classes of the Religious Education Board there have flourished, or one should rather say existed, a number of private Chedarim and also several public Talmud Torahs which were conducted on physical and educational lines that did not satisfy the lay-leaders of the community, and so failed to win the financial or moral support of the West End. The Chedar, though occasionally good, is usually the commercial speculation of a man whose chief qualification for teaching is that he has none for anything else. The Talmud Torah is a more democratic institution, and controlled by a committee chosen by the subscribers, but through lack of resources it is usually housed in places quite unfit for a school, most of all for a night-school; the teachers seldom possess any modern methods, the classes are invariably too large, and the hours of instruction exceed the maximum which would be beneficial in even a well-conducted school. Yet, with all these defects, the teachers succeed in hammering into most of their pupils a certain familiarity with Hebrew, and into some a certain knowledge of and permanent love for Judaism.

It has been calculated that of the 35,000 Jewish children attending public elementary schools in London, 8000 are attending classes of the Jewish Religious Education Board, 7500 are at Jewish Voluntary Schools, 2500 at Talmud Torahs, 2000 at classes attached to synagogues, and probably another 3000 receiving other tuition either at a Chedar or from a private teacher. That makes a total of 23,000 receiving instruction; but as some thousands of children are attending more than one kind of school it is probable that not much more than 21,000 (or two-thirds of the total number) receive any regular Jewish education. If West would work with East, appreciating its enthusiasm for the education and its anxiety for the Judaism of the young, and giving it the material help and the expert direction which it needs for its proper development, both overlapping and underlapping might disappear, and we might have one unified and adequate system of Jewish education in London.

Something indeed has been done in recent years to standardise the teaching at the different kinds of schools. The synagogue classes have formed themselves into a Union and organised a system of inspection; the Jewish Religious Education Board has appointed an Education Committee which exercises a supervision over its classes; the Talmud Torahs have united for common purposes under a Trust, which likewise has appointed an Education Committee to supervise the institutions under its control. Finally, the beginning has been made with a system of training Jewish teachers.

In course of time the separate unions may unite. But the one need which becomes yearly more pressing and more obvious is the foundation of a Jewish normal school, which shall train teachers adequate for every species of Jewish instruction, who will bring into the religious school not only increased knowledge, but modern method. It does not require a building, for Jews' College is the natural centre, and Jews' College must become the seminary for teachers as well as for ministers; but it does require an endowment, and no niggardly one. The New York Kehillah has procured a fund of £15,000 for a similar purpose; we should do as much and without delay. Knowledge is power, but Ignorance, it has been pointed out, is a greater power, and the destructive power of ignorance and the mischief of a Jewish manhood and womanhood ignorant of the principles of their faith and the history of their people are already painfully apparent in the conditions of English Jewry. We are justly proud of our charity for our people, and we provide adequately, if not liberally, for the wants of the poor and the suffering. But the greatest needs of Anglo-Jewry to-day are not material, but spiritual; we must help not so much sick Jews as sick Judaism; and, as the greatest of Greek philosophers taught, the regeneration of any society depends primarily upon the reform of education.

Jewish Statistics

The results of the decennial census of the United States, which has been taken recently, and the results of a similar enumeration of the greater portion of the British Empire next year, do not seem likely to contribute much new material for the study of Jewish statistics. Both in England and in the United States the objections to an inquiry as to religion are deep-rooted, although in other respects the state of mind which regards a general census as an infringement of personal liberty bordering on an Inquisition has disappeared. In Australasia and in Ireland, at least, the schedule of the census allows for an optional return in respect of religion; but in spite of the recommendation of the Census Committee of the Royal Statistical Society, by whose influence several other important innovations have been introduced in the new Census Bill, the Government have been unable to make a similar provision for next year's schedule. Nor were the representatives of the House of Lords more effective. Lord Newton's amendment "providing for the insertion of a column for the statement of religious profession," carried as it was by a narrow majority, met its expected fate when the Bill was sent back to the House of Commons. No doubt the objections to such an inquiry are well-founded, but even a voluntary return would have yielded more satisfactory results for the Jewish communities than can be obtained in the communal inquiries from which Jewish statistics are now computed. The American official returns of immigration include "Hebrew" as a nationality, while in England the Aliens Act has had at least this good result, that the Jewish authorities are enabled to watch much more closely and to analyse much more accurately the influx of their fellow-Jews into the country. But, after all, the Jewish problem, from the statistical as well as from every other point of view, is not concerned so much with the numbers who emigrate from Eastern Europe to the West as with what becomes of these immigrants after they have settled in England and in America. It is here that inquiries, scientifically conducted by statistical experts, could probe deeper into the disputed tendencies of Jewish development than is possible to-day, when assertions have only to be repeated often enough and loudly enough in order to be believed. For such inquiries, however, the statistical data are insufficient.

The communal statistics, with which inquirers like Mr. Joseph Jacobs have already done much, cannot be classed with Government returns, which have at their back all the resources of the State, and do not as a rule proceed one inch beyond safety in their conclusions. Without absolute accuracy and the greatest obtainable uniformity statistics are worse than useless; they are dangerous. Yet neither in respect of accuracy nor of uniformity are Jewish statistics above suspicion. Some years ago a paper on the study of the vital and other statistics of the Jews in the United Kingdom was read before the Royal Statistical Society by Mr. Simon Rosenbaum. The paper was highly commended for its ingenuity, and its conclusions were, on the whole, such as one might have anticipated—a low death-rate, a high birth-rate, a low infantile death-rate, a high expectation of life, and so forth. But the material on which the conclusions were based was extremely untrustworthy, and in the discussion which followed the reading of the paper there was considerable divergence of opinion as to what constituted a Jew; the definition given by Mr. Rosenbaum being, "one who when he dies is buried in a Jewish cemetery." The inadequacy of the material at the disposal of the Jewish statistician was further indicated in the criticism that even a religious census would be useless for statistical purposes without the corresponding figures for Jewish births and Jewish deaths returned by the same office.

The practical value of statistics has not been altogether unchallenged, and it is possible that results such as those given above, which could well enough be anticipated without statistical data, are held to prove that statistics of the less obvious kind are a mere luxury. There is, however, a stronger plea for the extension of Jewish statistics than is implied in the claims of scientific administration. Accurate Jewish statistics, inquiries at once comprehensive and trustworthy, are essential in order to combat anti-Semitism. The pseudo-economic form of anti-Semitism, which is its latest and most insidious expression, can only be overcome by well-grounded economic demonstration. Certain tendencies in the United States, for example, are not entirely calculated to inspire confidence in the future. In the last Annual Report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, among the measures proposed for the restriction of immigration, we find the novel and illuminating suggestion that ". . . careful consideration be given the question of inserting in the law an additional class of aliens to be excluded through administrative discretion of a broader scope than that which can be exercised with respect to 'persons likely to become a public charge,' said class to be described in some such apt term as 'persons economically undesirable.' . . ." The "apt term" has a Muscovite flavour, yet such terms cannot be refuted by any other terms, however "apt": they can be refuted only systematically and in detail. An excellent beginning, with this end in view, was made by the newly-formed "Verein für Jüdische Statistik" in 1903, under the direction of Dr. Alfred Nossig, whose valuable publication, *Jüdische Statistik*, summarised the existing material and indicated the directions in which development was desirable. Failing official assistance in procuring Jewish returns—and such a service cannot reasonably be demanded—the labours undertaken by private associations will have an increasing value as they become more systematic and entirely international. They will certainly cement more closely the material out of which the consciousness of Jewish nationality is being reconstructed.

Judaism and the Gospels

ENGLISH Jewry is at ease. There are no doubt traces here and there of anti-Semitism, nor are there wanting in the inner life of the community indications of what may be called " servitude in freedom." But when all allowances are made, the Jews enjoy a firmer and a more secure position here than in other countries, and anxiety for the future, with all that it involves, plays a smaller part in their mental life. Hence their internal development is more " normal " than elsewhere ; it is less at the mercy of external and accidental influences, but is rather determined by the spiritual and cultural resources of the community itself, and corresponds at any given time to the extent of those resources. To this circumstance is due the comparatively late appearance of the Reform movement in Anglo-Jewry. True, in the heyday of the German Reform movement a few people in England attempted to follow the German example ; but their small experiment never grew to considerable dimensions, or showed any capacity for development. The reason is that whereas in Germany there was an external, political impulse towards Reform—the desire to combat anti-Jewish feeling, and thus to facilitate the attainment of civil and political rights—in England this motive was less felt. For though certain political restrictions were still in force, the position of the Jews was much better, and their relations with non-Jews were much more satisfactory than in Germany.

But in more recent years education and the circumstances of life have brought about a change in the internal, spiritual condition of the Anglo-Jewish community : a new generation has arisen, which is very far removed from the *spirit* of Judaism. It is this internal change in the Jews which has called into being the

Reform movement which we now see developing before our eyes. To the difference in origin corresponds a difference in character. In Germany the Reform movement, practical in its motives, took a practical shape. Geiger and other Reformers endeavoured, on the one side, to alter the religious practices, and to bring them into conformity with what they conceived to be the needs of the time; but on the other side they laid stress on the grandeur of the religious and moral principles on which Judaism peculiarly was based, and tried to emphasise the *difference* between Judaism and Christianity. But in England the Reform movement springs from a spiritual cause—from a conviction on the part of many Jews that they are spiritually *akin* to their Christian environment. It is not merely the external observances of traditional Judaism that fail any longer to appeal to them; its innermost spirit, the fundamental ideas by which it is distinguished from Christianity, have lost their hold. Hence the movement here aims right at the heart; it wants to change the *spirit* of Judaism, and to overthrow its historical foundations, so as to reduce its distinctive features to a small compass, and to bring it as closely as possible into accord with the Christian ideas of the non-Jewish community. Thirteen years ago this movement was begun in England by a body of young men, who thus straightforwardly and clearly expressed their aim:

> ". . . Our triumphant emancipation is now working out its natural result upon us. Constant intercourse with non-Jews and extensive secular education must materially affect our opinions. We, who are young and earnest lovers of our religion, are struggling with new ideas which we hardly dare to formulate, because they are contrary to all accepted traditions. Such are the notions that our separateness seems now merely external and artificial, our racial distinctiveness often scarcely perceptible, and our religious ideas almost identical with those of Theists and true Unitarians." *

---

* *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January, 1897, p. 187.

But as it was difficult for them, in spite of everything, to abandon Judaism altogether, and to join the "Theists and true Unitarians," they conceived the idea of attaining their object in the reverse way. They would transform Judaism itself, until it should contain nothing but the fundamental ideas of the "Theists and true Unitarians," and then—so they fondly imagined—these latter would come and find shelter in Judaism, and so the "external and artificial" distinction would be comfortably and pleasantly removed! This movement did not take definite shape at the time, and after a while it disappeared and was no longer heard of. But the causes which had given it birth did not cease to work silently beneath the surface; and quite recently it has come forth again into the light of day, to play its part in the visible life of Anglo-Jewry. This time it appears in a more concrete form and with a clearer consciousness of the goal for which it is making. Its promoters have come to see, after all, that even if their Judaism is to teach the very doctrine of the "liberal" Christian sects, there will still be an "external and artificial" distinction between themselves and the non-Jew, so long as they do not accept the *source* of that doctrine—so long as they do not admit, with the "liberal" Christians, that the New Testament is the last word in religious and moral development, and Jesus the most perfect embodiment of the religious and moral ideal. For in matters of religion men value not alone the abstract beliefs in themselves, but also—and perhaps more highly—the historical and psychological roots from which those beliefs have grown up in their hearts. It was well said many years ago by Steinthal that if ever a new religion, a philosophical religion, suited to modern times, should unite Jews and Christians, they would still be divided on the question whether the Old Testament or the Gospels had contributed in greater measure to the birth of the new religion.

Our English Reformers, therefore, have decided to remove even this stumbling-block from the path which leads to unity, and have decreed that the New Testament (or at least the Gospels) must be considered a part—and the most important part—of Judaism, and that Jesus must be regarded as a prophet—and the greatest of the prophets—in Israel. This pronouncement is certainly a step forward along a certain line of development, of which we are not yet at the end. We need not therefore be surprised if these Reformers do not realise the strangeness of their attitude, with its combination of contradictory and mutually destructive postulates. Whereas revolution overthrows the old at a single stroke, and puts the new in its place, evolution destroys and builds in sections, so that, until its work is complete, it is full of contradictions and inconsistencies —the old and the new jostling one another in confusion, and creating by their unnatural juxtaposition the impression of a caricature, which is obvious to the onlooker, but not to those who are engaged in the work. So this Reformed Judaism, which wants to be two opposites—Jewish and Evangelist—at once, has its place as a rung in the middle of the ladder, a step on the road of evolution to its final goal. At this stage of the journey our Reformers still think that it is possible to put the Gospels *beside* the Old Testament and the Talmud. But when they reach the next stage they will recognise that the two cannot exist side by side, but only one above the other, and that when one stands the other falls. The early Christians went through the same process: they regarded their "message" at first simply as a part of Judaism; but when they had travelled the full length of their development, they saw that the Gospels meant the overthrow of the very foundations of Judaism, and then they left it altogether.

If anybody is doubtful about the true character and tendency of this movement, let him read the commentary on the Synoptic Gospels recently published by the leader of the movement, Mr. C. G. Montefiore.

The author makes no secret of the fact that the book has been written for Jewish readers, with the object of convincing them that the New Testament ought to occupy an important position in Judaism at the present time, albeit from a Jewish point of view. The claims of the "Jewish point of view" he thinks to satisfy by his frequent efforts to show that the Law of the Rabbis was not so bad as it is painted by the authors of the New Testament and its commentators, and that in many respects the old Judaism rose to the level of the Gospels, nay, had in certain details actually more of truth.* But the general atmosphere of the book is so utterly alien from the essential character of Judaism as to make one fact clear beyond a shadow of doubt to any Jew in whom Judaism is still alive—that the Gospels can be received only into a Judaism which has lost its own true spirit, and remains a mere corpse.

The author is doubtless correct in saying that a Jewish commentary on the New Testament is needed at the present time.† Living in a Christian environment, we imbibe a culture in which many Christian ideas and sentiments are inwoven, and it is therefore necessary for us to know their source, so as to be able to distinguish between them and the universal elements of culture. But this Jewish commentary must be far removed from any polemical propagandist intention on one side or the other. Its sole object must be to *understand* thoroughly the teaching of the Gospels, to define with *scientific* accuracy its character, the foundations on which it rests, and the differences which distinguish it from Judaism. What is needed is not the "scientific accuracy" of the Christian commentators (that spring from which Mr. Montefiore drinks with such avidity), who set out with the preconceived idea that the teaching of the Gospels is superior to that of Judaism, and use their "science" merely to find details in support of this general belief. When a writer claims to be "scientific," he must recognise above all that in the field of religion and morality it is impossible to set up a universal scientific criterion, by which to measure the different teachings, and to pronounce one superior to another. In this sphere everything is relative, and the judge brings to his task a subjective standard of his own, determined by his temperament, his education and his environment. We Jews, being everywhere a minority, are always subject to various influences, which counteract and weaken each other; and we, therefore, are possibly better able than others to understand objectively ideas which are not our own. Hence it was indeed right that there should be a Jewish commentary (not a Jewish panegyric) on the New Testament. Such a commentary might perhaps have enabled Jews of our author's stamp to recognise that it is possible to treat with seriousness and justice a religion which is strange to us, without shutting our eyes to the gulf which separates it from ourselves.

---

* Notes of this kind are found right through the book (see e.g. pp. 498–503, 691–3, and many other places); and it is unfair of some Jewish critics to have passed over this fact in silence, and to have described the book as though it were throughout simply an attack on Judaism.

† Introduction, pp. xvii. xviii. ci.

I should like to dwell for a brief space on the nature of this "gulf." So large a subject needs a whole book for its full treatment; but something, it seems to me, ought to be said just at this moment—and perhaps the need is not confined to England.

If the heathen of the old story, who wished to learn the whole Torah standing on one leg, had come to me, I should have told him: "'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness'—that is the whole Torah, and the rest is commentary." The essential characteristic of Judaism, which distinguishes it from other religions, is its absolute determination to make the religious and moral consciousness independent of any definite human form, and to attach it *immediately* to an *abstract* ideal which has "no likeness." We cannot conceive Christianity without Jesus, or even

Islam without Mohammed. Christianity made a god of Jesus, but that is not the important fact. Even if Jesus had remained the "son of man," had been only a prophet, as Mohammed is to the Mussulmans, that would not have affected the thing that really matters—the attachment of the religious and moral consciousness to the figure of a particular man, who is regarded as the ideal of absolute perfection, and the goal of men's vision; to believe in whom is an essential part of a religion inconceivable without him. Judaism, and Judaism alone, depends on no such human "likeness." God is the only ideal of absolute perfection, and He only must be kept always before the eye of man's inner consciousness, in order that man may "cleave to his attributes." The best of men is not free from shortcomings and sins, and cannot serve as an ideal for the religious sentiment, which strives after union with the source of perfection. Moses died in his sin, like any other man. He was simply God's messenger, charged with the giving of His Law; his image was not worked into the very fabric of the religion, as an essential part of it. Thus the Jewish teachers of a later period found nothing to shock them in the words of one who said in all simplicity: "Ezra was worthy to be the bearer of the Law to Israel, had not Moses come before him" (*Sanhedrin*, 21*a*). Could it enter a Christian mind, let us say, to conceive the idea that Paul was worthy to be the bearer of the "message," had not Jesus come before him? And it need scarcely be said that the individual figures of the other Prophets are not an essential part of the fabric of Judaism. Of the greatest of them—Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, and others—we do not even know who or what they were; their personalities have vanished like a shadow, and only their words have been preserved and handed down from generation to generation, because they were not *their* words, but "the word of the Lord that came unto them."

This applies equally to the Messiah, who is awaited in the future. His importance lies not in himself, but in his being *the messenger of God* for the bringing of redemption to Israel and the world. Jewish teachers pay much more attention to "the days of the Messiah" than to the Messiah himself. One of them even disbelieved altogether in a personal Messiah, and looked forward to a redemption effected by God Himself without an intermediary; and he was not therefore regarded as a heretic.

This characteristic of Judaism was perhaps the principal obstacle to its wider acceptance. It is difficult for men in general to find satisfaction in an abstract ideal which offers no hold to the senses; a human figure much more readily inspires enthusiasm. Before the triumph of Christianity the Greeks and the Romans used to accuse the Jews of having no God, because a divinity without "any likeness" had for them no meaning; and when the time came for the God of Israel to become also the God of the nations, they still could not accept His sway without associating with Him a divine ideal in human form, so as to satisfy their need for a more concrete and nearer ideal.

This is not the place to discuss the origin of this distinctive preference on the part of Israel for an *abstract* religious and moral ideal. Be the reason what it may, the fact remains true, and has been true these thousands of years; and so long as Israel undergoes no fundamental change, and does not become something different, it cannot be influenced on the religious side by a book like the Gospels, which finds the object of religious devotion and moral emulation not in the abstract Godhead alone, but first and foremost in a man born of woman. It matters not whether he be called "Son of God," "Messiah," or "Prophet," Israel cannot accept with religious enthusiasm, as the word of God, the utterances of a man who speaks in his own name—not "thus saith the Lord," but "*I* say unto you." This "I" is in itself sufficient to drive Judaism away from the Gospels for ever. And when our author speaks in glowing terms of the religious and moral exaltation which spring from attachment to Jesus as the ideal of holiness and perfection, meaning, as is evident from his tone, to introduce this attachment into Judaism (pp. cvii, 210, 527), he is simply proving that he and those who think with him are already estranged from the essential nature of Judaism, which does not recognise ideal holiness and perfection in man. "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy"—that is Judaism. "Ye shall be holy, because the Messiah (or the Prophet) is holy"—that is an ideal better calculated, no doubt, to inspire enthusiasm and exaltation among the peoples; but it will never kindle the religious fire in Israel unless the very last drop of true Judaism be dried up. It was not for nothing that our ancient teachers called God "*the* holy one, blessed be He": for Judaism absolute holiness exists only in the one God. We have had no doubt, at various periods, our mystic sects, which, influenced consciously or unconsciously by foreign ideas, have here turned aside more or less from the Jewish road. But the sect is only a temporary and partial phenomenon, pointing to some internal disease which affects the national life in a given period. Our history shows that the end of these sects is to die out, or to leave Judaism. Sects come and sects go, but Judaism remains for ever.

This fundamental tendency of Israel to rise clear of "any likeness" in its religious and moral life is evident not only in relation to the religious and moral *ideal*, but also in relation to the religious and moral *goal*. There is no need to dilate on the well-worn truth that the Law of Judaism sees its goal not in the "salvation" of the individual man, but in the prosperity and perfection of the general body; that is to say, of the nation, and, in "the latter end of days," of the whole human race—a collective idea which has no defined concrete form. In the most fruitful period of Judaism, the period of the Prophets and "the giving of the Law," it had no clear idea on the subject of the survival of the soul and reward and punishment after death. All the enthusiasm of the Prophets and their disciples was derived not from this source, but from the conviction of their being children of "the chosen people," which was entrusted by God (as they believed) with the mission of embodying religion and morality, in their highest form, in its national life. Even in later times, when the Babylonian exile had destroyed the nation's freedom, and the desire for individual salvation had consequently come to play a part in the religious consciousness, the *highest* good of Judaism still remained collective. Scholars will need no proof of this fact. For those who are not scholars it will be sufficient to examine the daily and festival prayer-books, in order to realise that only a small part of the prayers turns on the particular needs of the individual, while most deal with the concerns of the *nation* and the human race in general.

Which of these two goals is "superior"? This question has already been endlessly debated; and the truth is that we cannot here establish a scale of values. A man may attain to the highest eminence in his religious and moral life, whether he pursues this goal or that. But individual salvation is certainly nearer to the hearts of most men, and is better suited to kindle their imagination and to inspire them with the desire for moral and religious perfection. If Judaism, as distinguished from other religions, prefers the collective goal, this only means that here also there makes itself felt that tendency to abstraction and to the repudiation of the human image which is peculiar to Israel. So long as this tendency remains—so long, that is, as our people does not lose its essential character—no true Jew will be able to feel any great fondness for the doctrine of the Gospels—a doctrine which rests (despite our author's endeavours to present the matter in a more favourable light, cf. pp. 211, 918) wholly and solely on the pursuit of individual salvation.

The tendency of Judaism which I have mentioned shows itself in yet one other matter, and this perhaps the most important, in the basis of morality. It is an oft-repeated formula that Jewish morality is based on *justice*, and the morality of the Gospels on *love*. But it seems to me that not all those who draw this distinction fully appreciate its meaning. It is usual to regard the difference only as one of degree, the moral scale and its basis being the same in either case. Both doctrines, it is supposed, are directed against egoism; but the Christians hold that their religion has reached a higher stage, while the Jews refuse to admit their claim. Thus the Christian commentators point proudly to the *positive* principle of the Gospels: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them" (Matt. vii. 12; Luke vi. 31), and thereby disparage Judaism, which has only the *negative* principle of Hillel: "What is hateful to thyself do not unto thy neighbour." Mr. Montefiore debates the matter, and cannot make up his mind whether the positive principle really embraces *more* in its intention than the negative, or whether Hillel and Jesus meant the same thing. But of this at least he is certain, that if Hillel's saying were suddenly discovered somewhere in a positive form, the Jews would be "rather pleased," and the Christians would be "rather sorry" (p. 550).

But if we look deeper, we shall find that the difference between the two doctrines on this point is not one of less or more, but that there is a fundamental difference between their views as to the basis of morality. It was not by accident that Hillel put his principle in negative form; the truth is that the moral basis of Judaism will not bear the positive principle. If the positive saying were to be found somewhere attributed to Hillel, we should not be able to rejoice; we should have to impugn the genuineness of a "discovery" which put into

Hillel's mouth a saying opposed to the spirit of Judaism.

The root of the distinction lies here also, as I have said, in the love of Judaism for *abstract* principles. The moral law of the Gospels beholds man in his individual shape, with his natural attitude towards himself and others, and asks him to reverse this attitude, to substitute the "other" for the "self" in his individual life, to abandon plain egoism for inverted egoism. For in truth the altruism of the Gospels is neither more nor less than inverted egoism. Altruism and egoism alike deny the individual *as such* all *objective* moral value, and make him merely a *means* to a subjective end; but egoism makes the "other" a means to the advantage of the "self," while altruism does just the reverse. Now Judaism removed this subjective attitude from the moral law, and based it on an abstract, objective foundation, on *absolute justice,* which regards the individual as such as having a moral value, and makes no distinction between the "self" and the "other." According to this view, it is the sense of justice in the human heart that is the supreme judge of a man's own actions and of those of other men. This sense must be made independent of individual relations, as though it were some separate abstract being; and before it all men, *including the self,* must be equal. All men, including the self, must develop their lives and their faculties to the utmost possible extent, and at the same time each must help his neighbour to attain that goal, so far as he is able. Just as I have no right to ruin another man's life for the sake of my own, so I have no right to ruin my own life for the sake of another's. Both of us are men, and both our lives have the same value before the throne of justice.

I know no better illustration of this point of view than the following well-known *B'raitha:* "Imagine two men journeying through the desert, only one of whom has a bottle of water. If both of them drink, they must both die; if one of them only drinks, he will reach safety. Ben P'tura held that it was better that both should drink and die, than that one should witness the death of his comrade. But Akiba refuted this view by citing the scriptural verse, 'and thy brother shall live with thee.' *With thee*—that is to say, thine own life comes before thy neighbour's" (*Baba M'zia*, 62*a*).

We do not know who Ben P'tura was, but we do know R. Akiba, and we may be sure that through him the spirit of Judaism speaks. Ben P'tura, the altruist, does not value human life for its own sake; for him it is better that two lives should perish, where death demands but one as his toll, so long as the altruistic sentiment prevails. But Jewish morality regards the question from an objective standpoint. Every action that leads to loss of life is evil, even though it springs from the purest feelings of love and mercy, and even if the sufferer is himself the agent. In the case before us, where it is possible to save one of the two souls, it is a moral duty to overcome the feeling of mercy, and to save. But to save whom? Justice answers—let him who can save himself. Every man's life is entrusted to his keeping, and to preserve your own charge is a nearer duty than to preserve your neighbour's.

But when one came to Raba, and asked him what he should do when one in authority threatened to kill him unless he would kill another man, Raba answered him: "Be killed, and kill not. Who hath told thee that thy blood is redder than his? Perhaps his blood is redder" (*P'sachim*, 25*b*). And Rashi, whose "sense of Judaism" generally reveals to him the hidden depths of meaning, correctly understands the sage in this case, and explains thus: "The question only arises because thou knowest that *no religious law is binding in the face of danger to life*, and thinkest that in this case also the prohibition of murder ceases to be binding *because thine own life is in danger*. But this transgression is unlike others. *For do what thou wilt, there must here* *be a life lost*. . . . Who can tell thee that thy life is more precious in the sight of God than his ? Perhaps his is more precious."

If a man brought a question like this to a Christian priest, the priest would certainly begin to expatiate in glowing terms on the duty of a man to sacrifice his life for another, to " bear his cross " in the footsteps of his " Messiah," so that he might win the kingdom of heaven—and so forth. But the Jewish teacher weighs the question in the scales of objective justice : " Seeing that in either case a life must be lost, and there is none to say which of the two lives is more precious in God's sight, therefore your own danger does not entitle you to break the sixth commandment. Be killed ; kill you must not ! " But suppose the case reversed ; suppose the question to be " Another is going to be killed, and I can save him by giving my life instead of his, what shall I do ? " Then Raba would have replied : " Let such a one be killed, and do not destroy thyself. For do what thou wilt there must here be a life lost ; and who hath told thee that his blood is redder than thine ? Perhaps thine own is redder." From the standpoint of Judaism every man's blood is as red as any other's, every soul is " precious in the sight of God," be it mine or another's, therefore no man is at liberty to treat his life as his own property ; no man has a right to say : " I am endangering myself ; what right have others to complain of that ? " (Maimonides' Code, *Laws of Murder*, XI. 5). The history of Judaism can tell, indeed, of many acts of self-sacrifice, the memory of which will remain precious and holy for all time. But these are not cases of one life given for the preservation of another similar life, they are sacrifices of human life for " the sanctification of the Name " (the religious ideal) or for " the good of the community " (the religious goal).

And justice demands that we rise above sentiment not only in deciding as between the self and another, but also in deciding as between two other persons. Forty years ago Abraham Geiger—the man in whom our latter-day "Reformers" see their spiritual father—pointed out that the Jewish commandment "Neither shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause" reveals a morality of unparalleled loftiness.* All other moral codes warn us only against favouring the persons of the rich and the powerful; and the Gospels, as is well known, favour the persons of the poor, and have much to say of their merits and their future greatness. All this is very well from the point of view of the heart; but a morality based on justice rises above sentiment, and teaches that it is our duty to help the poor man if we are able, but that mercy must not induce us so far to sin against justice as to favour the poor man in his suit.

Herbert Spencer anticipates, as the highest possible development of morality, the transformation of the altruistic sentiment into a natural instinct, so that at last men will be able to find no greater pleasure than in working for the good of others. Similarly Judaism, in conformity with its own way of thought, anticipates the development of morality to a point at which *justice* will become an instinct with good men, so that they will not need long reflection to enable them to decide between different courses of action according to the standard of absolute justice, but will *feel* as in a flash, and with the certainty of instinct, even the slightest deviation from the straight line. Human relations and social grades will not affect them in the least, because the "true judge" within them will pronounce justly on each deed, swayed by no human relation to the doer or the sufferer, considering not whether this one or that is the self or another, is rich or poor. And since Judaism associated its moral aspirations with the "coming of the Messiah," it attributed to the Messiah this perfection of morality, and said that "he will smell and judge"

---

* *Das Judentum und seine Geschichte* (2nd edition), p. 26.

(*Sanhedrin*, 93*b*), on the basis of the scriptural verse: "And shall make him of quick understanding [Heb. "smell"] in the fear of the Lord; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes." "Because the smell is a very delicate sense, he gives the name of *smell* to the most delicate feeling . . . that is to say, the Messiah *with little attention will feel which men are good, and which evil*" (Isa. XI. 3, with Kimchi's commentary).

But this development lies far ahead in the hidden future. At present the human race still lacks the instinctive "sense of justice," and even the best men are apt to be blinded by self-love or prejudice, so as to be unable to distinguish between good and evil. At present, therefore, we all need some touchstone, some fundamental principle, to help each of us to avoid weighting the scales of justice to suit his own ends or satisfy his personal inclinations. Such a principle Hillel gave us: "What is hateful to thyself do not unto thy neighbour." Altruism teaches: "What thou desirest that others should do unto thee, that do thou unto them." In other words: take the circle of egoism, and put in its *centre*, instead of the "self," the "other"; then you will know your whole duty. But Judaism cannot find satisfaction in this substitution, because it demands that *justice* shall be placed at the centre of the circle—justice, which makes no distinction between "self" and "other." Now in the circle of egoism there is no place for justice except in a negative form. What egoism does *not* wish for itself—that, certainly, it will be just *not* to do to another. But what egoism *does* wish for itself is something which has no limits; and if you oblige a man to *do* this to others, you are inclining the scales of justice to the side of the "other" as against the "self."

Even that "great principle in the Law" (as R. Akiba called it), "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," though in form it appears to be positive, is in reality, if rightly understood, negative. If the Torah had meant that a man must love his neighbour to the extent of sacrificing his life for him, it would have said : " Thou shalt love thy neighbour *more than* thyself." But when you love your neighbour *as* yourself, neither more nor less, then your feelings are in a state of perfect equilibrium, with no leaning either to your side or to your neighbour's. And this is, in fact, the true meaning of the verse. " Self-love must not be allowed to incline the scale on the side of your own advantage ; love your neighbour as yourself, and then inevitably *justice* will be the deciding factor, and you will do nothing to your neighbour that you would consider a wrong if it were done to yourself." For proof that this is the real meaning we have only to look further in the same passage of Leviticus, where we find : " And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself " (Lev. xix. 33, 34). Here it is evident that to love the stranger " as thyself " means to carry out the negative precept " ye shall not vex him" ; and if the stranger is expressly placed on the same footing as the native, this shows that in relation to the native also the intention is only that self-love must not prove a stronger motive than justice.

But in the Gospels the commandment " Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself " receives an altruistic sense : it means that your own life is less important than your neighbour's. Hence it is possible to find some small justification for the habit which Christians have of attributing this verse to the Gospels, as though it appeared there, and not in the Mosaic Law, for the first time. It is true that *the meaning which they put on the verse* belongs not to our Law, but to the Gospels.*

---

* John Stuart Mill writes : "In justice to the great Hebrew lawgiver, it should always be remembered that the precept to love thy neighbour as thyself already existed in the Pentateuch ; and very surprising it is to find it there" (*Three Essays on Religion*, 2nd edition, p. 98). Had Mill understood the precept in its original sense, he would certainly not have

But it must be remembered that in addition to the relation of individual to individual, there is another and more important moral relation—that of nation to nation. Here also some " great principle " is needed to keep within bounds that *national* egoism which is fraught, perhaps, with even greater danger to the collective progress of humanity than individual egoism. If we look at the difference between Judaism and Christianity, in regard to the basis of morality, from this point of view, we shall see at once that the altruism of the Gospels is in no way suited to serve as a basis for international relations. A nation can never believe that its moral duty lies in self-abasement, and in the renunciation of its rights for the benefit of other nations. On the contrary, every nation feels and knows that its moral duty is to keep its position and use its powers as a means of creating for itself satisfactory conditions of life, in which it can develop its potentialities to the utmost. Since, then, Christian nations could not base their relations one with another on the moral basis of their religion, national egoism inevitably remained the sole determining force in international politics, and " patriotism," in the Bismarckian sense, attained the dignity of the ultimate moral basis.

But the Jewish law of justice is not confined within the narrow sphere of individual relations. In its Jewish sense the precept, " Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," can be carried out by a whole nation in its dealings with other nations. For this precept does not oblige a nation to sacrifice, for the benefit of other nations, its life or its position. It is, on the contrary, the duty of every nation, as of the individual human being, to live and to develop to the utmost extent of its powers; but at the same time it must recognise the right of other nations to fulfil the like duty without let

---

been surprised to find it in the Mosaic Law. But even so logical a thinker could not free himself from the influences of his education and his environment, and he did not see that a meaning had been read into this verse which was opposed to its literal sense.

or hindrance, and "patriotism"—that is, national egoism—must not induce it to disregard justice, and to fulfil itself through the destruction of other nations.* Hence Judaism was able thousands of years ago to rise to the lofty ideal expressed in the words, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation." This ideal is, in fact, only an inevitable logical consequence of the idea of absolute justice which lies at the foundation of Judaism.

Many pages might be filled with the further development of these general ideas; and as many more might without difficulty be given to an exposition of the differences between the two doctrines in points of detail, in such a way as to show that the detailed differences are but the outcome of the broad and fundamental difference between Judaism and Christianity, and that all the compromises and concessions whereby Mr. Montefiore tries to make peace between the two creeds have no real value, either theoretical or practical. But it is not my purpose here to write a book, and I will content myself, so far as general principles are concerned, with the brief hints above set forth. As for details, I will touch here on only one point, to which our author himself attaches more than ordinary importance, and will leave the reader to draw his own conclusions as to the rest.

The Gospels, unlike Judaism, forbid divorce, either absolutely, as in the version of Mark (x. 2–12), or with an exception in the case of unfaithfulness, as in the version of Matthew (xix. 3–12). At the present time, when all Christian nations are struggling with the prohibition of divorce, which came to them from the Gospels, and are trying to annul it or restrict its operation within narrow limits, it may be taken as fairly evident that the recognition of divorce, even on other grounds than unfaithfulness, is demanded by the conscience of society. Nor is it surprising that Judaism, with its essentially social aim, has been true to its general spirit in its attitude on this question, and has decided, with the school of Hillel, that divorce is permissible not alone on the ground of unfaithfulness, but also when there is from other causes a rupture of the bond of sympathy between man and wife. The important thing here is not the cause, but the effect—the rupture within the home, which must lower the moral tone of the life of the family, and interfere with the proper upbringing of the children. Long experience has taught Judaism that there is no reason to go back on this decision. Even the enemies of Israel cannot deny that Jewish family life has reached a high level of morality; and a result like this does not come about by a miracle, in the teeth of the national code of law, least of all in the case of the Jews, whose life has always been so profoundly influenced by the prescriptions of the Torah.* It must indeed be admitted that at first only the husband had the right of divorce, and no wife could divorce her husband. In conformity with the primitive view (a view still widely accepted all over the world) that man alone is important, and woman is but "an help meet for him," it was demanded above all things of the husband that his position in the home should correspond to his moral obligations as the father of the family, and that he should not be compelled by law to live with a woman who was distasteful to him, and to become the father of "children of a hated wife." But when once it came to be recognised that married life cannot tolerate constraint, this recognition, limited at first to the side of the husband, was bound to be gradually extended to the wife. Hence arose the provisions under which a man may be compelled to divorce his wife (*K'thuboth*, ch. VII). These provisions enabled the wife to obtain a divorce against the husband's will, by decree of the courts, on many and various grounds. Thus it is impossible to assert that Judaism does not allow a woman to divorce her husband. In the cases just mentioned it is, in fact, the wife who divorces, though the bill of divorcement is technically given by the husband. What matters is not who performs the legal action, but whose wish it is that brings about the divorce. This tendency to emancipate the wife reached its highest development in the dictum of Maimonides, that if a woman says " My husband is distasteful to me, and I cannot live with him," although she gives no specific reason for her dislike, the husband is yet compelled to divorce her, " because she is not like a captive woman, that she should consort with a man whom she hates " (*Laws of Marriage*, XIV. 8). Here we see the Jewish attitude to marriage in its full development. Marriage is a social and moral cord, the two ends of which are in the hearts of husband and wife ; and if the cord is broken at either end—whether in the husband's heart or in the wife's—the marriage has lost its value, and it is best that it should be annulled. It is true that the jurists who came after Maimonides could not rise to the conception of so perfect an equality of the sexes, and did not wholly accept his dictum. But the mere fact that the greatest authority deduced this decision *from the Talmud* (and the Talmud, in fact, affords ground for his view—see *Maggid Mishnah ad loc.*) is proof conclusive as to the real tendency of the Jewish law of divorce, and shows whither it leads in the straight line of development.

---

* The Russian philosopher Wladimir Solovioff was the first, if I am not mistaken, to attempt to find a moral basis for international relations in the precept "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," taken in the sense mentioned above. This philosopher was an untiring student of Judaism, for which he had an appreciation unusual among Christians—a fact not without its significance.

---

* Mr. Montefiore, indeed, does not admit this. In his opinion the morality of Jewish family life is a fact not because of the laws, but in spite of them. If you ask how such a thing is possible, he replies somewhat as follows: It has already been remarked that Judaism does not obey the laws of cause and effect, and we sometimes see a certain tendency in Jewish life which ought logically to have certain effects, but has in practice just the opposite results (p. 335). Truly an easy and comfortable "philosophy of history"!

But the New Testament view of marriage and divorce reveals a very different tendency (Matthew and Mark, *locc. citt.*; Paul, First Epistle to the Corinthians, VII). As in all the teaching of the Gospels, so here the important thing is *individual* salvation. For the sake of his individual salvation it is better that a man should not marry at all, but should "suffer," and be "a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake." But he who has not strength to suffer may enter into the covenant of marriage with a woman; only this covenant, too, is an *individual* matter, based on *religious mysteries*, not a social and moral act, and therefore it can never be annulled, even if it results in injury to the life of society. "He which made them at the beginning made them male and female and said . . . they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. *What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*" From this standpoint it is immaterial whether there is love or hatred between the couple, whether their union is or is not a good thing for the life of the family and of society. All this does not affect the real point: God has united them, and how shall man dare to separate them? *

The Catholic Church, correctly understanding the Gospel teaching, has built countless houses of refuge for celibates of both sexes, and has forbidden divorce absolutely, without regard to all the evil results of this prohibition in the embitterment of the life of families and the moral corruption of thousands of men and women. Other Christian Churches have stopped short of this extreme, but have still been unable to free themselves from the Gospel standpoint, so that until recently they have tried to restrict and render ineffective the recognition of divorce. But now at last all Christian nations are beginning to see that this standpoint is not productive of good to the world, and are approaching nearer to the Jewish view.*

---

* Even Matthew, who permits divorce on the ground of unfaithfulness, makes this exception (as some Christian commentators have pointed out) only because the sanctity of the marriage is profaned by the sin, and the divine union is annulled *of itself*. The point of view is essentially the same in both versions.

But Christian theologians, in commenting on the Gospels, cannot give up that great principle of theirs, that the Gospel teaching is always based on a higher morality than that of Judaism. And in this case, too, they have found a way—rather far-fetched, it is true—of establishing the truth of their principle. In forbidding divorce, they say, Jesus only meant to protest against the injustice of Judaism to the wife, who could be divorced but could not divorce. He therefore took the right of divorce away from the husband, so that he should have no advantage over the wife. Here, then, is moral "progress," a battle on woman's behalf against the oriental barbarism of the Jews, and so forth. We might perhaps point out that there was a more sensible way of bestowing equality on the wife, if that was Jesus' object—to wit, by giving the wife also the right of divorce. And we might ask, further, how it is that Matthew, who allows the husband to divorce his wife for *her* unfaithfulness, never hints at any right on the part of the wife to demand a divorce from the husband on the ground of *his* unfaithfulness.† Where, in fact, is the vaunted assertion of the wife's rights ? The commentators vouchsafe no answer to these plain and simple questions. But, indeed, there is no need of much questioning. It must be perfectly clear to all who read these passages in the Gospels without preconceived ideas that Jesus, in prohibiting divorce, had not the remotest notion of fighting the wife's battle. The plea is from beginning to end a theological invention, designed to bolster up the theory.

---

* In England the question has become so acute that the Government has appointed a Commission to find means of making divorce easier. Men of knowledge and experience, in evidence before the Commission, have expressed the opinion that the restriction of the possibility of divorce has very evil results.

† In England the law to-day is still in the spirit of Matthew; the wife's unfaithfulness is sufficient ground of divorce for the husband, but the reverse does not hold good.

Let us now see what our *Jewish* commentator has to say on this subject (pp. 235–42, 508–10, 688–92). Whoever has not the leisure or the inclination to read the whole eleven hundred pages of Mr. Montefiore's book will find it sufficient to read the pages given to this question, in order to obtain an adequate idea of the real spirit which prevails among our author's following. As he repeatedly pours out the vials of his wrath in harsh and crude denunciations of the Jewish law of divorce, his tone is that of a monk just emerging, Gospel in hand, from his retreat, who has no desire to know anything whatever as to the views which prevail at the present day in the world around him. It is " to his eternal dishonour " that Hillel allowed divorce on other grounds than that of unchastity; it is " most unfortunate " for the Rabbinic law that it endorsed his decision. But " the unerring ethical instinct of Jesus led him to put his finger upon the weak spots and sore places of the established religion," and " of all such weak spots and sore places this was the weakest and the sorest." Hence " in no other point was the opposition of Jesus to the Rabbinic law of profounder significance " (p. 235). In this strain our author continues, with a varied selection of choice phrases. Nor does he forget to adopt from the Christian commentators the theory that the Gospels were fighting the wife's battle; he repeats it several times, here also in a tone of harsh condemnation of Judaism and grateful praise of Jesus (p. 240 and elsewhere). It does not occur to him that the Christian commentators were driven to invent this theory because they saw that from the standpoint of our own age the prohibition of divorce is not in itself a sign of moral progress. But if the recognition of divorce on other grounds than that of unfaithfulness is " an eternal dishonour," then of course there is no need to invent this plea of a battle for the wife's rights, the mere prohibition being sufficient proof of " progress." Nay, there seems to be more lost than gained by this "battle," for if that was really the intention of the prohibition of divorce, then the prohibition must of necessity be absolute (to the exclusion even of the ground of unfaithfulness), since otherwise we are at a loss to understand why the wife, too, was not permitted to obtain a divorce on that ground. But our author himself admits that the prohibition of divorce in case of unfaithfulness had very evil results (p. 242). Where, then, is the "unerring ethical instinct"? There are other similar difficulties, and even plain inconsistencies, to be found in our author's treatment of this subject. But we have already dwelt on it at sufficient length. Whoever reads all the related passages in the book will be satisfied that there is here neither logic nor "science," nor true, unbiassed judgment, but such partiality to Jesus and the Gospels as the most pious Christian might envy.

It may be worth while, by way of completing the picture, to add just one further point. When our author reaches the end of the passage in Matthew, where the "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake" are extolled, he finds himself in some perplexity (pp. 690, 691). Clearly, his moral sense is revolted. But how gentle is his language! You will find nothing here about "eternal dishonour" or the like. He lowers his voice in submissive reverence, and tries to find excuses for the Gospel, so that you cannot recognise in him that "higher tribunal" which condemned without mercy what he thought the "weak spot" in *the law of his ancestors*. True, this fact demands no comment; but I am reminded of the author's anticipation (Introduction, p. xix) that Christian critics would find him too Jewish, and Jewish critics too Christian, and I merely wish to remark that this difference of attitude will stamp him, even in the eyes of Jewish critics, as, in one respect at least, *too much of a Jew*.

After what has been said above, it may perhaps appear to many that it was not worth while to give so much attention to such a book, and possibly from the point of view of scholarship and literature they are right. But, as I have already hinted, the book deserves special attention as a revelation of the psychology of a certain section of Jews. It shows us a new kind of Jew, hitherto unknown to history, who has lost every trace of the mighty sorrow which his ancestors felt for the exile of the nation and the exile of the "Shechinah," and who yet has a sorrow of his own—the sorrow of a meaningless isolation. He sees that the world has gone its own way, leaving the Jews alone with their Torah. This isolation is not unbearable so long as the Jew understands or feels that it is necessary to the preservation of his sacred ideals; but the real need for it can certainly not be felt by those Jews who think that the difference between themselves and their neighbours is "external and artificial," and for whom Judaism is nothing but a dear inheritance, which must be preserved out of respect for their fathers. Hence they seek in various ways to escape from their isolation. Thirteen years ago they believed that they could attain their object by basing Judaism on certain universal beliefs of the Theists. Now they recognise that this is not enough; they go a step further and tack on Jesus and the Gospels. This development appears clearly from many passages in the book under notice, of which I will quote here one of the most explicit:

"Dogmatic Christianity in the course of centuries may disappear; Trinitarianism may be succeeded by Unitarianism; but the words of Jesus will still continue to move and cheer the heart of man. If Judaism does not, as it were, come to terms with the Gospels, it must always be, I am inclined to think, a creed in a corner, of little influence and with no expansive power. Orthodox Jews would, I suppose, say that they want no more. Liberal Jews should be less easily satisfied" (p. 906).

We can certainly understand the state of mind of these Jews; but they themselves ought also to understand it aright. They would then see that their state of mind has no relation to the question of "orthodox" and "liberal" Judaism in the usual sense of the words. A Jew may be a liberal of liberals, without forgetting that Judaism was born "in a corner" and has always lived "in a corner," apart from the great world, which has never understood it, and therefore hates it. Such was the lot of Judaism before the rise of Christianity, and such it has remained since. History has not yet satisfactorily explained how it came about that a tiny nation in a corner of Asia produced a unique religious and moral point of view, which has had so profound an influence on the rest of the world, and has yet remained so foreign to the rest of the world, unable to this day either to conquer it or to surrender to it. This is a historical phenomenon to which, despite a multitude of attempted answers, we must still attach a note of interrogation. But every true Jew, be he "orthodox" or "liberal," feels deep down in his being that there is something in the spirit of our people—though we know not what it is—that kept it from the highroad taken by other nations, and impelled it to build up Judaism on those foundations for the sake of which the people remains to this day confined "in a corner" with its religion, being incapable of renouncing them. Let them who still have this feeling remain within the fold; let them who have lost it go elsewhere. *There is no room here for compromise.*

ACHAD HA'AM.

London, Tammuz, 5670.

Translated from the Hebrew MS.
by Leon Simon.

The American Immigration Laws in their Relation to the Jews

THAT the Jews of the United States are deeply interested in the immigration policy of their country is natural, if only in view of the large number of Jewish immigrants who have settled there during the past thirty years. We estimate that there are to-day about two million Jews in the United States, of whom about one million live in the city of New York. Before the Russian-Jewish expulsions of 1881 began, there were only about a quarter of a million Jews in the whole United States, of whom about one hundred thousand resided in New York City. We are therefore bound to ascribe the increase over these earlier figures almost wholly to the immigrants of the past thirty years and their progeny. The Government records show that out of a total immigration of 1,199,566 during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1907, 149,182 "Hebrews" were admitted at our ports, of whom 114,932 came from Russia, 3605 from Roumania, and 18,885 from Austria-Hungary. The financial panic and temporary partial abatement of anti-Semitic persecution in Russia caused the Jewish immigration to fall during the year ending June 30th, 1908, to 58,773 out of a grand total of 782,870, and for the year ending June 30th, 1909, to 57,551 out of a grand total of 751,786. The division of the Jewish immigration of the past year into classes of sex and age seems fairly typical; there were 31,057 males to 26,494 females; 15,210 of these immigrants were under fourteen years of age, 38,465 between 14 and 44, and 3876 were forty-five years old or more. Of the Jewish immigrants of this last-mentioned year over fourteen years of age, 4832 males and 7369 females recorded themselves as unable to read or write; 25,312 that they had less than $50 in cash with them, 43,827 that they were going to relatives, 10,840 to friends, and 3867 to neither relatives nor friends. The total number of recorded immigrants of all races who have come to the United States during the past ninety years is 26,852,732, of whom Great Britain and Ireland furnished 7,667,000, Germany 5,320,000, Austria 2,913,000, Italy 2,870,000, and Russia 2,204,000; the Russian immigration (including Polish) did not reach 10,000 in any one year until 1880, and during the last fiscal year embraced 120,460, of whom only 39,150 were Hebrews. The classification by the Government of "Hebrew" immigrants as such began only in 1899, when 37,415 were enumerated; about 60,000 were recorded in 1900, 58,000 in 1901, 57,600 in 1902, 76,000 in 1903, 106,000 in 1904, 129,900 in 1905, and 153,748 in 1906, the high-water mark. During the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1910, the total immigration has reached about one million once more, and the "Hebrew" immigration is proportionally greater than the 57,551 of the former year. As a very large proportion of the immigrants are destined for New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and Chicago, cities already very thickly populated, the problems resulting from this immigration naturally engage much public attention; and labour unions and farmers' alliances and occasionally coteries of politicians have demanded restrictive legislation. Demands for such laws resulted, as a compromise, in a substantial codification of subsisting laws in 1907, and the appointment of an Immigration Commission, which will submit its final reports on the subject before the close of this year.

The value of immigration to American development has been incalculable and boundless; it alone made possible America's remarkable progress. In a sense, of course, all America's citizens are foreigners, who have settled here during the past three centuries, and supplanted the Indian aborigines; but in a more restricted sense also, as applied to foreign-born persons, the above estimate of the value of immigration in American history is correct. Already in the eighteenth century American Jews were prominent in building up our national and international commerce and finance, and had achieved high rank in the army; and in a work just published by the Census Bureau, entitled *A Century of Population Growth*, it is estimated that there were in 1790 1243 Hebrews in the United States. Thomas Jefferson, in his famous message as President, in 1801, employed the immortal, oft-quoted words which have so long expressed the American policy of hospitality to all aliens: "Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? . . . Might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to every one manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us?" It is true that fears and embarrassment at the possible consequences of a well-nigh constantly growing immigration have been expressed in some quarters from time to time, particularly during the so-called "Know Nothing" era, when opposition to the immigrant became an important political issue. The former "Know Nothing" crusade ended with the adoption of a resolution of Congress in 1868, which still stands upon our statute books, declaring that "the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and . . . in the recognition of this principle, this Government has freely received emigrants from all nations and invested them with the rights of citizenship."

Naturally, the advisability of legislating to keep out the foreign criminal and pauper suggested itself at an early day; and various States, particularly New York and Massachusetts, enacted laws authorising the exaction of bonds against pauper immigrants becoming public charges—which might be commuted by a small "head-tax" payment so that a fund might be established for the relief of foreign paupers, who had no "settlement" here. Though various provisions of this character had been sustained at early dates as constitutional by our highest court, the more drastic character they were assuming, and the complications they were leading to, as possibly violating treaties with foreign countries, induced the United States Supreme Court in the 'seventies to declare such State enactments unconstitutional assumptions of a power vested in the federal Government alone. Accordingly, in 1882, Congress assumed jurisdiction of this subject matter, and passed "An Act to regulate Immigration," so as to effect the exclusion of "convicts, lunatics, idiots, and persons unable to take care of themselves without becoming a public charge." The Act provided for the collection of a head-tax of fifty cents for every alien passenger landing in the United States, convertible into an immigrant fund, to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the enforcement of the Act, and "for the care of immigrants arriving in the United States, and for the relief of such as are in distress." In 1885 the first of our so-called "Contract Labour" laws was passed, forbidding aliens from coming over here, under contracts previously made for their employment, and prohibiting persons from assisting such aliens to come over by prepayment of their transportation or otherwise encouraging their migration. The object of the Act was to prevent persons from taking advantage of the lower scale of wages abroad, by bringing employees over, ready and willing to work for lower wages than prevail here, and thus depressing the American standard of wages. This is a distinctive American enactment, and is often a stumbling-block for the immigrant coming over here without money, as absence of position is an important factor to be considered in determining whether the immigrant is likely to become a public charge.

By an Act of March 3rd, 1891, the excluded classes were enlarged by the addition of "persons suffering from a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease," which phrase is defined by the administrative officials as including trachoma and favus; and also by excluding "polygamists," and "persons whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown on special inquiry that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes." In spite of its awkward and indefinite phraseology, this last provision was intended, as stated in the report of the Congressional Committee which drafted it, merely to "cure the weakness of the pauper clause in the present law." The classes of excluded persons were further enlarged by the addition, in 1903, of epileptics, and persons who have been insane within five years, professional beggars, anarchists, and procurers, and in 1906 of imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, mentally or physically defective persons, whose defect may affect the ability of such an alien to earn a living, persons suffering from tuberculosis, and children under sixteen, unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labour, or if excluded under his Regulations. Roughly speaking, then, and disregarding the Chinese Exclusion Laws, only persons under affirmative disabilities which are likely to injure this country are excluded by the statutes; and there is little, if any, ground to object to the provisions of the laws themselves if intelligently construed and administered.

In the matter of administration, however, there is room for considerable injustice and blundering in particular cases. Already in 1891 the right of judicial review in immigration cases, previously enjoyed through suing out writs of habeas corpus, was cut off; and determinations were made non-reviewable, except on appeal to the Secretary of the Treasury, now Secretary of Commerce and Labour. Except where there is lack of "due process of law," the determinations of the immigration officials, even though involving errors of fact or of law, are non-reviewable in the courts, contrary to the principle that our "Government is one of laws and not of men." The determination of the Government medical officials at the ports of entry as to the presence of disease, and as to whether it is a "loathsome or dangerous contagious disease," is not reviewable in any way, even by appeal to superior departmental officials; and there are frequent complaints of incorrect diagnoses, particularly in alleged trachoma cases. When the immigrant seeks to land, he is first examined thoroughly by the Government medical officials, and then by single Immigrant Inspectors who are authorised to land him only if he appears "clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to land"; in default of such showing, he is held for the action of a "Board of Special Inquiry," consisting of three officials, who hear the applicant and such other witnesses as appear before them. From the determination of the Board, an appeal lies to the Secretary of Commerce and Labour. Before the single examining inspector and the Board of Special Inquiry, the immigrant is not in practice entitled to have counsel or friends present, the examination being "separate and apart from the public." This leads on occasion to injustice, because of the unfamiliarity of the immigrant with the law and the procedure, and with the language in which the examination is conducted, though Government interpreters are constantly called into requisition before the Boards, and stenographers take down all the evidence. On the appeal to the Secretary, the alien is entitled to counsel, who is permitted to examine the evidence, reinforce it where practicable, and submit briefs. Each race or nationality has representatives at Ellis Island, the immigration station for the port of New York, and the Jewish bureau is particularly efficient, and conducts appeals and aids the immigrant as far as practicable. At New York, the "Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society" and the "Council of Jewish Women" look after the interests of Jewish immigrants; and the former organisation maintains a Home at which to shelter them, while the "Clara de Hirsch Home for Immigrant Girls" receives Jewish girls not called for by immediate relatives, and retains them till suitable positions are obtained. All of these organisations receive subsidies from the Baron de Hirsch Fund, which also maintains a Jewish Trade School and an Agricultural School, and subsidises special immigrant classes for instruction in English and civics in a number of large cities. Since Oscar Straus was succeeded in 1909 by Charles Nagel as Secretary of Commerce, Mr. William Williams became Commissioner of Immigration at the port of New York, the administrative official in charge of Ellis Island. He has enforced the law far more stringently than formerly, and issued several circulars of instruction of doubtful validity, which have led to a harsher administration. In one of these, dated June 4th, 1909, he gave notice that "it is necessary that the standard of inspection at Ellis Island be raised." And in a subsequent circular, directed to the steamship companies, notice was given that "in most cases it will be unsafe for immigrants to arrive with less than twenty-five dollars ($25), besides railroad ticket to destination, while in many instances they should have more." The circular went on to add that "except in instances deemed by the Government to be of exceptional merit, gifts to destitute immigrants after arrival will not be considered in determining whether or not they are qualified to land; for, except where such gifts are to those legally entitled to support (as to wives, minor children, etc.), the recipients stand here as objects of private charity, and our statutes do not contemplate that such aliens shall enter the country." A money requirement had been proposed to Congress, and defeated in 1907; and in itself absence of twenty-five dollars cash does not establish likelihood to become a public charge; while the arguments that such payments make the recipient an "object of private charity," and that danger arises of susceptibility to becoming chargeable upon such "private charity," as distinguished from "public charge," are erroneous expositions of the law. An attempt made by the writer, in conjunction with Mr. Abram I. Elkus, of New York, in the summer of 1909, to secure a judicial pronouncement of the illegality of these circulars was thwarted, because, after habeas corpus proceedings were started, the Government admitted all four petitioners into the country, despite their prior rejection by the Board of Special Inquiry, which had been affirmed on appeal. One of these applicants was shown to have had several thousand roubles worth of property in Russia, though only \$2·75 on his person at the time of landing.

The incompetency of the ill-paid Immigration Inspectors, and the panic and confusion they were thrown into by Mr. Williams's confusing circulars, as also by the reckless public discussions concerning proposed amendments of the law, have led to an appreciable increase lately in the percentage of exclusions of immigrants, including Jews. An analysis of the percentage of exclusions generally and of Jewish exclusions for three prior years is instructive. During the year ending June 30th, 1907, 13,064 aliens were debarred, including 1257 Jews, of which latter number 808 were excluded as paupers or likely to become public charges, and 362 as suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases. Further, 112 Jews were returned abroad within three years after admission, out of a total of 995 such deportations; the percentage of Jewish exclusions to admissions was 87/100 of 1%, as against a little over 1% of the total exclusions. During the year ending June 30th, 1908, 10,902 aliens were debarred, including 679 Jews, of which latter number there were 237 excluded as likely to become a public charge, 85 as defective mentally or physically in a manner that may affect their ability to earn a living, and 193 as suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, including 148 alleged trachoma cases; the percentage of Jewish exclusions within three years of arrival to admissions was about 6/10 of 1% as against a little over 1 39/100% of the total exclusions.

During the year ending June 30th, 1909, 1041 aliens were debarred, including 614 Jews, of which latter number there were 225 excluded as likely to become a public charge, 42 upon surgeon's certificate as defective mentally or physically, and 228 as suffering from diseases, including 157 alleged trachoma cases; 229 Jews were returned abroad, out of a total of 2124 such deportations; the percentage of Jewish exclusions to admissions was about 1 6/100% as against 1 38/100% of the total exclusions.

In gauging, however, the effectiveness of the American laws in keeping out undesirables, regard must be had to the deterring effect of the knowledge of these statutes in discouraging immigration; the Government's figures show that during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1907, 65,000 immigrants were prevented from embarking abroad for the United States, after applying for tickets, chiefly in consequence of the disclosures of the foreign medical examinations. As the Supreme Court of the United States has just sustained the constitutionality of a statute, authorising the Secretary of Commerce and Labour to impose a fine of $100 upon steamship companies for each alien brought over here suffering from a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, the existence of which might have been detected by means of a competent medical examination before embarkation, the steamship companies may find themselves compelled to make these examinations abroad more rigid. It is also probable that this principle will be extended, in order to compel steamship lines to investigate abroad as to the presence of other non-medical disabilities barring the right to land.

The recent increased severity of the administration of our immigration laws has increased the percentages of exclusions appreciably; and though only a small percentage are in fact excluded, any individual may become the victim of a blundering administration. The bulk of the exclusions are, as has been shown, on the score of presence of trachoma, which should, in fact, generally be discovered abroad, likelihood to become a public charge, and mental or physical defect that may affect earning capacity. These last two classes are inherently indefinite and elastic terms; and under the stimulus of the pending agitation for more rigid laws, the number of Jewish exclusions for these reasons has appreciably increased, and Boards of Special Inquiry are often cowed into excluding because of alleged physical defects having little real relationship to ability to earn a livelihood. Jewish immigrants are particularly likely to suffer from this circumstance, as their difficulties in the way of diet, both on the steamer and often weeks earlier, from the time of leaving their homes, greatly aggravate their debilitated condition on arrival, especially in view of the inferior steerage accommodation on certain lines; in fact, the federal Immigration Commission, in its preliminary report upon "Steerage Conditions," emphasises this very point. Besides, the characteristically slight physique of the Russian Jew is often mistakenly described in medical certificates as "lack of physical development." However, even as it is, we note that the percentage of Jewish exclusions is considerably smaller than the average; and ex-President Roosevelt, ex-President Cleveland, the Mayor of New

York City, and President Eliot of Harvard, among others, paid eloquent tribute to the value of the American Jewish immigrant, in connection with our 250th Anniversary Celebration in 1905. President Taft recently expressed himself to the same effect. Such authorities ought to meet the arguments of certain petty doctrinaires, official and otherwise, who claim that the immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe are of inferior "race value," and should not be permitted to come over here. The total of Jewish deportations, authorised within three years after entry, is markedly small, for the Jews look largely after their own poor and unfortunate, and strive, as does no other race, to prevent them becoming public charges. During the past three years the Government has been maintaining an "Information Bureau" in connection with its Immigration service, designed to secure a more satisfactory distribution of immigrants, and prevent them all settling in the congested large cities, by removing them to points where economic conditions are more satisfactory. In this respect, too, Jews have been long in the van; the Jewish removal office, first organised by the Baron de Hirsch Fund, and latterly a separate organisation, has induced nearly 50,000 Jews to remove to interior points and settle there; and similarly, farming and like trades are encouraged among the Jewish immigrants by these and other organisations.

In conclusion, it will be well to examine some of the amendments proposed to our Immigration Laws, in the direction of rendering them more rigid and sweeping. The most drastic of the "Amendments" is the so-called "Elvin's Bill," which proposes to increase the head-tax from $2 to $25 for every arriving alien. The increase would greatly cripple immigrants, and do little or no good to the public treasury; and it runs counter to the principle under which this tax has heretofore been levied, to provide merely for the cost of administering the law and aiding the immigrants. The Bill further provides that aliens over sixteen years of age shall be excluded, unless able to read and write English or the language of some other European country, or Hebrew or Yiddish; a similar Bill passed Congress some years ago, but was vetoed by President Cleveland; and the figures furnished above show that it would exclude a considerable number of Russian Jews, particularly women, as Russia often thwarts all their efforts to secure an education. The value of such a test is doubtful, in view of the very large number of Jewish immigrants who acquire an education here immediately after landing.

Again, the proposition not to admit male persons over sixteen years of age, unless they carry with them in their own right at least one hundred dollars in money, would exclude many thousands, as the average amount of money carried along by immigrants has heretofore been a little less than $25.00. It is further proposed to require from persons over sixteen years of age a certificate of good moral character from an official of the country of departure or the United States Consul there, which would be costly, and for Russian Jews almost impossible to obtain, because of the necessarily clandestine character of their departure from home. The present statutory authorisation to admit aliens under bond against their becoming public charges, now seldom exercised, though very useful, is to be further limited or repealed, and the "Information Bureau" above referred to abolished. In another Bill it is proposed to establish as another excluded class "persons economically undesirable," a term so vague, uncertain, and dangerous as to leave exclusion largely to the whim or caprice of the petty examining officials. As above stated, however, all new immigration legislation is being postponed until the final report of the Immigration Commission has been submitted.

MAX J. KOHLER.

Jewish Philosophy of the Middle Ages

The study of philosophy in England, being remote from the affairs of daily life, does not command the esteem attaching to those other branches of study of which the utility is more obvious, such as law, medicine, science, and theology. This is one of the points in which the difference is most marked between England and Germany, where philosophy is either the first of studies, or at least second to none. And as with philosophy in general, so with Jewish philosophy in particular. The study of the Jewish philosophical literature is prosecuted much more vigorously in Germany than in England, and the books which are published in German on the subject are not only more numerous than those published in English, but are also in many cases much more advanced and technical, assuming on the part of the reader a state of preparedness which no English writer would venture to expect. Nevertheless, considering how eminently practical the Anglo-Jewish community affects to be, it must be admitted that the Jewish philosophical literature of the Middle Ages has fared better at its hands than might have been expected. At least the elements of the subject may be learnt from books written in English; and it may be taken for granted that these at any rate will be found more *readable* than the corresponding works in German. There are, in the first place, actual translations, such as that of the *More Nebuchim*, by Dr. M. Friedländer; of the *Cusri*, by Dr. H. Hirschfeld; and the *Ethics of Berachya*, by Dr. H. Gollancz. Then there are several scattered essays, too numerous to mention; and there is, of course, a mine of information (not all gospel, unfortunately) in the *Jewish Encyclopædia.* And as a welcome proof that interest in the subject is rather growing than otherwise may be mentioned the fact that of seven essays in *Aspects of the Hebrew Genius*, three (on Saadiah, Philo, and Aristotle in Jewish Philosophy) deal directly with branches of this subject, while two others (on Maimonides and Jewish Mysticism) touch on it indirectly.

There is, however, a cogent reason why English Jews should from time to time be given detailed information about striking German books on Jewish subjects. Jewish studies in England stand, so to speak, under the ægis of the Church, and, whether conducted by Jews or Christians, usually have their root in some theological interest, and smack of the Faculty of Divinity. But in Germany, Jewish subjects are studied on general scientific grounds, and, being approached from a purely secular standpoint, are embraced in the schemes of universal history and philosophy. The English way, possibly, is better, as being more conducive to harmonious relations between Jews and Christians; but it is advisable that English readers should be reminded occasionally of the German way, and should be made acquainted with the results it has achieved.

The German book we choose for this purpose is Dr. David Neumark's *Geschichte der Jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters.* Its publication coincided with Dr. Neumark's appointment to a professorship at the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati. In this capacity he must be regarded as one of the forces which are moulding the future of American Reform Judaism. Now since the visit of two American Reform Rabbis to England last winter, we may consider that the barrier which has hitherto separated American "official" Judaism from English has been broken through, and that, whatever we may think of the American Rabbinate and its tendencies, we can no longer simply ignore it. Hence there is a special reason why we should scrutinise Dr. Neumark's book at the present juncture.

English Jews will sympathise with Dr. Neumark in his desire to find "a living source of instruction for all who cannot and will not resign themselves to be excluded from the intellectual life of their time" (p. 11). But they may differ from him as to the mode of obtaining this. He seeks it in a "modern Jewish *philosophy*"; English Jews, we think, require rather a modern Jewish *theology*. Of course, there are English Jews who have a bent for philosophy; but it is a *sine qua non* for such readers to familiarise themselves with the German language, in which they may be safely left to prosecute their philosophical studies. Those who wish to receive their intellectual nourishment in English will hardly be able to digest it unless it has some theological flavouring. Hence the revival of Judaism in England, if it is to come at all, must start not with philosophy, but with theology; with a restatement and solution, not of philosophical, but of theological problems, in a form suitable to the conditions of the present day.

However, in practice the difference between philosophy and theology is largely one of terms, and the two run throughout on parallel and neighbouring lines. They may be compared to two sets of coinage which have corresponding values, but are only current in their respective countries. Both theology and philosophy are necessary for the establishment of *religion* in its fullest and most comprehensive sense; for, as Dr. Neumark says (p. 10), "For those who do not possess two souls and who look to their religion to give them their conception of life and the world, their religion will be their philosophy, and they will with justice expect from it an answer to all the questions which have hitherto occupied philosophy." Hence in trying to found a modern Jewish *philosophy* Dr. Neumark evidently thinks he is meeting the great religious need of Judaism in Germany; and though that is not precisely our need, yet it is so closely analogous that any attempt to deal with it on really original lines cannot fail to be instructive.

As the first step in the creation of such a "modern Jewish philosophy," Dr. Neumark has in this volume given a history—or rather the first part of a history—of the Jewish Philosophy of the Middle Ages. The point of view from which he approaches his subject is thus made perfectly clear at the outset. He sets out, on the one hand, from an intimate correlating of the Jewish literature of the Middle Ages with the needs of the present day; and this lends remarkable freshness and power to his treatment of the philosophical views and systems of the authors whose works he interprets. He successfully raises Jewish philosophy from the condition of "a mere historical study, to which it has been unwittingly degraded." But, on the other hand, through his exclusive interest in philosophy, he overlooks the fact that the literature, of which he is writing the history, is not merely philosophical, perhaps not even in the first instance such. It is true that we commonly call it the "Jewish philosophical literature"; but the most cursory reading of the *Cusri*, or even of the *Guide of the Perplexed*, will show that these works are not less *theological* than philosophical. German scholars admit this by the fact that they place these works in the category of *Religions-philosophie*. Dr. Neumark ignores the theological side of this literature; he turns his blind eye to it, so to speak; and this not merely detracts from the completeness of his work as a history of the Jewish philosophical literature of the Middle Ages, but at times leads him into serious error.

However, the discovery of a living interest in this literature is a notable feat. Dr. Neumark finds a connecting link between himself and the old Jewish philosophers in the fact that both he and they adopt the same idea as the basis of their philosophical systems—the idea which he calls *ethical monotheism* (*der ethische* *monotheismus*). Unfortunately, he nowhere gives a definition of these words; but it must be admitted that they convey a considerable amount of meaning even to the lay mind without further definition. Dr. Neumark, then, wishes to build up a philosophical system embodying the latest results of human research on the basis of this fundamental idea, and he finds that similar systems were built up by such men as Saadiah, Bachya, Ibn Gabirol, Jehuda Halevi, and Maimonides in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, embracing the whole field of human knowledge as it was comprehended in their days. The reason why their systems are no longer suitable to us is that the study of natural science has made immense advances, and we can no longer accept their views as to the construction of the physical universe. Nevertheless, Dr. Neumark thinks, and reasonably, that in our endeavour to construct "a monotheistic system of transcendental philosophy" we may profit very considerably by a careful study of the way in which our great philosophers of the Middle Ages set about a similar task.

To say that Dr. Neumark has performed this task well would be but moderate praise for his work. His book is a veritable mine of information on all points connected with Jewish philosophy as defined by him—that is, as the attempt to explain the physical universe from the standpoint of ethical monotheism. He traces this attempt through the whole range of Jewish literature, from the Bible to the Zohar. He gives a full account of the physical and metaphysical explanation of the universe given by Aristotle, and developed by the Arabic philosophers of the early Middle Ages; and then a detailed examination of the attempts made by various Jewish writers—from Israeli at the beginning of the tenth to Maimonides at the end of the twelfth century—to show that the scientific facts adduced by Aristotle could be explained on the basis of "ethical monotheism." The interest of the scientific side of

Dr. Neumark's book, however, is overshadowed by another feature of the work which calls for prior consideration. Dr. Neumark is not content merely to interpret Maimonides, but does this avowedly as the first step towards making himself a kind of Maimonides for the present day. He sets out to do for this generation what Maimonides did for his, i.e., according to his view, to give it a Jewish *Religions-philosophie.* English Jews, with their strong turn for the "practical," may not care what it was precisely that Maimonides did for his generation. But Maimonides is still officially the lawgiver and teacher of the bulk of the Anglo-Jewish community; and when a claim is put forward by any one that the mantle of Maimonides has fallen upon him, we must examine his credentials very carefully. Dr. Neumark's claim to be continuing the work of the Jewish philosophers by founding a modern Jewish *Religions-philosophie* may be invalidated in two ways; first, by showing that he does not go the right way about to construct such a philosophical system as he desires; secondly, by showing that he misconceives the nature of the so-called "philosophical" Jewish literature of the Middle Ages, and that the primary object of its writers was something else than the founding of a Jewish *Religions-philosophie.*

On the first of these grounds we may take Dr. Neumark at his own valuation. He lays down in his introductory chapter three tasks for modern Jewish philosophy: first, the exposition of the history of the Jewish religion from a philosophical standpoint; secondly, a history of the Jewish Philosophy of the Middle Ages; thirdly, a systematic presentation of the principles of Judaism on the basis of a modern philosophical outlook (*Weltanschauung*). These formulæ afford a good enough working basis for the matter in hand. Dr. Neumark has started with the second of his three tasks, and the book he has produced is certainly a first step towards the construction of a " modern Jewish philosophy." Jewish philosophy, he says, has to explain the universe on the basis of ethical monotheism. In other words, it has to construct a Jewish religion and ethical system adapted to the needs of the present day. But the same task is presented to Jewish *theology*. And granted that the Jewish philosophical writers undertook and performed this task, the question arises, how they did so ; whether on the basis of philosophy or of theology or both.

Now wherein lies the difference between the philosopher and the theologian ? In this : that the philosopher derives his idea of God from contemplation of the universe, and the theologian from his experience of human life. The philosopher admires the unfailing concatenation of cause and effect in the physical universe, and concludes from it the existence of a Guiding Intelligence. The theologian observes the play of moral and spiritual forces in human conduct, and infers the existence of a Personal God. The Germans might say that one starts from a *Weltanschauung* and the other from a *Lebensanschauung*. It is, of course, the natural tendency of each to encroach on the field of the other. The philosopher wants to apply his theories of cause and effect to the field of human conduct, and the theologian wants to find in the phenomena of nature the evidences of a Divine Will. Each aims at framing a system of ethics which shall be based on his peculiar conception of God ; and it is a question of the first importance to every rational being whether his ethical code is to be derived in the last resort from philosophy or theology ; whether he is to serve the Supreme Intelligence or the Personal God.

To assist us in gaining a firmer grasp of these two conceptions we have at our disposal the literatures of two ancient peoples—of the Hellenes and of the Israelites. The philosophic conception of God finds its fullest and best expression in Plato and Aristotle, the theological in the Old Testament. Hence we may call the first the Hellenic and the second the Hebraic conception of God; and similarly with the systems of ethics derived from these two conceptions. These systems vary almost from age to age; but at any given period we can find a representative of each in vogue among the leading races of mankind, and it is perhaps the conflict of the two which more than anything else has led to the progress of society. The philosopher objects to the moral system of the theologian because it ignores the law of cause and effect; the theologian objects to the moral system of the philosopher because it ignores the existence of the moral sense in man. Each tries to frame an irreproachable moral code without having recourse to the mainspring of the other; and it is this competition which keeps the human mind from stagnation.

One need hardly say that the standpoint of the Jewish philosophers of the Middle Ages was the theological. A cursory perusal of their works will show that wherever they deal with ethics they assume without question the existence of a Personal God as the final arbiter of right and wrong. To quote only one proof: they all insist on the value of prayer as an ethical exercise; and prayer obviously supposes a Personal God. Nor is it only for the purposes of their ethical systems that they adopt the Hebraic conception of God. It permeates their work, and is equally prominent in Saadiah's literary exegesis, in Ibn Ezra's psychological reflections, in Jehuda Halevi's lyrical outpourings, and in Maimonides' historical disquisitions. In fact, only when they are dealing with the phenomena of the physical universe do they take notice of the Greek conception of God as an abstract Intelligence; and then it is to show that this God and their Hebraic God are one and the same Being.

It is in virtue of this last function that they have earned the title of philosophers; and it must be admitted that this philosophic reasoning forms the basis of their ethical systems. They are willing to let their ethics stand or fall by their success in showing that the Guiding Intelligence of the physical universe is also a Personal God, distinguishing between right and wrong. It is this which has made Jewish philosophical literature a dangerous edge-tool in Jewish life, and which has caused it to be looked on with suspicion by the more narrow-minded and timid among Jewish moralists; though on the whole it has been a tremendous asset to Jewish morality. At the present day, owing on the one hand to the changed conditions under which we live, on the other hand to our different conceptions of physical science, we are not to be so easily influenced either for good or for evil by this literature; and Dr. Neumark is certainly right in thinking that its lessons need to be re-taught in a language more intelligible to the present generation.

But is Dr. Neumark the man to do this? It seems to us that he lacks the one essential qualification; he has not the Hebraic conception of God. Surely no man who knew what was meant by a Personal God could write such sentences as the following: "Must that idea (the philosophical God-idea) which on the side of science is called upon to remove the element of casualness from sense-experience (*die Zufälligkeit der Erfahrung aufzuheben*) be formed into a poetical conception of a self-conscious, Personal God, and *can* this highest Being fulfil such a task? Are not perhaps casualness and personality in the last resort different expressions for one and the same idea, one and the same fact?" And lest we might imagine that he is merely quoting the arguments of a transcendental philosopher, we read a few lines lower down: "It will be seen that the development of Jewish philosophy presents to us a series of decisive turning-points which have prepared the way for its attachment to transcendental philosophy." Which reminds us that Christian theologians have for centuries been finding decisive passages in the Old

Testament which have prepared the way for the attachment to something else.

The aim of the old philosophers was to give to religious Jews enough knowledge of philosophy to enable them to keep abreast with the science of their time. The aim of Dr. Neumark is to give transcendental philosophers enough religion to enable them to pass as Jews. This may be what is required in Cincinnati; but in England we shall not confound it with the teaching of the mediæval Jewish philosophers. It is certainly a very interesting inquiry which examines the particular systems of philosophy adopted by the various Jewish thinkers to explain the physical universe—whether Neoplatonism or Aristotelianism or a mixture of both. It is also important to know where they ventured to differ from their Greek authorities, and how by doing so they justified their belief in a Personal God. But we must never forget that this and this only was their objective in philosophy; and any philosophy which has not this for its object cannot rightly call itself Jewish, and cannot possibly lead to a Jewish system of ethics.

It would be well that Dr. Neumark's book should stimulate English Jews to prosecute more vigorously the study of the Jewish philosophical literature from its theological side. We have in England already what the Germans would call the necessary *Anlage*, and only require the proper stimulus to proceed. Unfortunately, the policy of "official" Judaism in this country has hitherto been simply to ignore the problem of Science and Religion, or of Hellenism and Hebraism. With mandarin-like haughtiness the clerical mind refuses to argue on its dogmas, and has but a pitying contempt for those who cannot intuitively see the correctness of its position. The consequences of this are already commencing to show themselves in two ways. On the one hand, the mass of the people, taught to rely solely on authority, are forgetting the distinction between Jewish and non-Jewish clergymen; devoid of the rudiments of philosophy and unschooled in the forming of abstract ideas, they can no longer endure the intellectual severity of the Old Testament, and seek to temper it with the emotional sensuousness of the New. On the other hand, a small band of "intellectuals" who have, so to speak, disciplined their mental faculties up to the German standard, considering the case against religion to have gone by default, have let the Bible go by the board altogether, and plunged headlong after the *ignis fatuus* of Political Zionism. Under these circumstances it may be permitted to suggest that the Jewish philosophical literature of the Middle Ages, if properly studied, if approached, that is, from its Hebraic and not its Hellenic side, may be found to have a very direct bearing on the problems of the present day. The authors of that literature lived under conditions which find a closer counterpart in the Jewish life of England, or rather of the English-speaking world, than of Germany. It is English students, therefore, who have the best opportunity of establishing the correct "personal relation" with those authors; and by availing themselves of that opportunity to the utmost, they can render the greatest service to their people at the present day.

M. Simon.

The History of the Prayer-Book

(*Concluded*)

We have formed some idea of the growth of the principal sections of the daily morning service. In our prayer-book, however, it is preceded by a considerable body of matter, which falls into two heads: (i.) private prayers; (ii.) Psalms, and the song of Moses.

(ii.) Dealing with the latter portion first, we find that its introduction is due to the Rabbinic recommendation to begin with words of praise. The number of psalms is added to on Sabbaths and Holy Days. This section is introduced and concluded with a blessing, in the one case the prayer, "Blessed be He who spake,"* and in the other "Praised be Thy name."† These compositions appear to be of great antiquity. So is the beautiful passage said on Sabbaths and Holy Days, "The breath of every living being."‡

The first section of the prayer-book does not, properly speaking, belong to the Synagogue service at all. It consists of prayers which were originally said in the home, and which have since been transplanted into the Synagogue. Some of them still retain the singular number in which they were written. Nor does the reader at the present day invest himself with the Tallith till their conclusion. Some of the prayers were obviously composed and originally intended for use immediately on awaking. Such are the blessings directly referring to waking, washing the hands, dressing, and so forth. The German Jews appear, following the example of Meir of Rothenburg, who lived in the thirteenth century, first to have instituted the inclusion of this section among the prayers of the Synagogue.[*] The French Jews were slower in following the innovation.

---

* Singer, p. 16. † Singer, p. 36.

‡ Singer, p. 125. See Talmud Babli, *Pesachim*, 118*a*.

The succession of blessings on pages 5–6 of the Authorised Prayer-book seems to have grown up gradually. Thus the blessing "Who giveth strength to the weary," is not found in the prayer-book of R. Amram of the ninth century. Some at least of these blessings were probably not intended for everyday use.

In the other prayers we find a considerable divergency of usage; the explanation lies in their nature as optional, as opposed to statutory prayers. Some of them are composed by Rabbis for themselves, and subsequently popularised through the action of their schools. The fine prayer, אלהי נשמה, "O my God, the soul . . ."[†] is mentioned in the Talmud as a prayer that may be said on waking. In the same passage we meet with the first ויהי רצון, "May it be Thy will . . . And lead us not into temptation . . . Keep us far from a bad companion . . ."[‡], of which the blessing immediately preceding it forms part. As quoted in the Talmud, the singular number is used throughout. It is much to be regretted that the simplicity of so essentially individual a prayer should have been marred by a partial change into the plural. The following prayer, "May it be Thy will . . . to deliver me this day . . ." was used by the famous "Judah the Prince," one of the compilers of the Mishnah. Amongst other such private prayers quoted in the Talmud is the יהי רצון, the prayer for life, which is now said on the Sabbath before the New Moon. The first verse,[§] however, containing a reference to the coming month, is a later addition. The author, "Rav," who lived in the third century, composed it for everyday use.

Here are two prayers which have not been included in the prayer-book:—[‖]

R. Zevia used to end his prayer thus: "May it be

---

[*] Berliner, *Randbemerkungen zum täglichen Gebetbuche*, p. 10.

[†] Singer, p. 5.

[‡] Singer, p. 7, ad init.

[§] Singer, p. 154.

[‖] *Berachoth*, 16*b*.

Thy will, O Lord our God, that we may not sin, or be confounded or be put to shame for our fathers."

R. Hija used to pray: "May it be Thy will, O Lord our God, that Thy Law may be our faith, and that our heart grow not faint nor our eyes dim."

Amongst similar prayers is one composed by "Rava" (fourth century). It is the prayer commencing, "O my God, before I was formed."* It was written for the Day of Atonement, and we still use it for that occasion, though at one time it was introduced as a daily prayer.

The prayer, "O my God, guard my tongue from evil,"† was used by Mar, son of Rabina, (fifth century) to conclude the Amidah. It contained a phrase which has now slipped out: "Deliver me from an evil occurrence, from the evil inclination, from an evil woman, and from all evils that distract the world." The selection of a particular sex seems ungenerous, but perhaps the unsophisticated Rabbi felt less in need of protection from men.

It can hardly, I think, be sufficiently regretted that this old usage, by which the individual was encouraged even in the synagogue to frame some portion of his prayer for himself, has fallen into desuetude. There is now no blank page in the prayer-book. Nor can the worshipper exercise even the right of selection which he once possessed, and choose his prayer where he cannot make it. The chief culprit, at whose door the blame for this stereotyping process must be laid, is probably the printing-press. It may, perhaps, one day be mitigated by restoring into the prayer-book some of the best of the many individual prayers recorded in the Talmud, in the ancient Siddurim, and elsewhere—not as part of the regular service, but as a collection of purely optional prayers suggested for individual devotion.

To illustrate this point further, let me refer to the תחנון, the "supplication,"‡ said in the synagogue on week-days with bowed head. It was originally a silent prayer said after the Amidah, " A voluntary outpouring, in which each man prostrated himself before God and silently composed his own prayer."*

---

* Singer, p. 263. † Singer, p. 54. ‡ Singer, p. 62.

The Siddur of R. Amram contains a number of suitable prayers, leaving it to the worshipper to select from them. " Sovereign of all Worlds, may it be Thy will that Thy Law may be my faith and my work every day, and suffer me not to go astray in it. Put me not in need of the gifts of flesh and blood, for the gift is small, and the reproach is great." And, again: " Sovereign of all Worlds and Lord of lords, help me and support me in my livelihood and the livelihood of my family. Put me not to shame, either before Thee or before flesh and blood."

At the present day these beautiful prayers have entirely disappeared. Their place is taken by a solitary psalm (Ps. VIII.), which, strangely enough, is prefixed by a line which has no connection with it, " And David said unto Gad," etc. (2 Sam. XXIV. 14), whilst the true heading of the psalm is altogether omitted. The explanation is, no doubt, that the verse from Samuel at one time formed a short introduction to one of the prayers composed to serve as the silent " supplication." It is noteworthy that the Portuguese ritual has Psalm XXV. instead of Psalm VI.: " Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul."

To return to our subject. We have cast a glance over the evolution of the morning service, and have seen how its tripartite division came into existence. We have, however, so far, only examined the skeleton of the body, the framework of the edifice. This was successively filled in and embellished by later prayers and hymns. The *piyut* (derived from ποιήτης, poet) was an artificial excrescence upon the rigid form of the statutory service. The *piyutan*, as the author is called, appears very early, and must have been at work as far back, at least, as the seventh century. His compositions constantly increased. Sabbaths, Festivals, and Penitential Days all afforded him good opportunities. Many Rabbis discountenanced these additions, viewing with dismay the inroads they were making. But they proved popular. They gave variety to the service, and an opportunity to the Chazan. Indeed, the Chazan sometimes intoned his own compositions. We find, therefore, as might be expected, an immense diversity in the piyutim that obtain in different communities, and even in the same communities at different times. Chief amongst piyut-writers is Eleazar Kalir. His country is uncertain; so is his date, which is variously assigned between the eighth and tenth centuries. He may be called the father of the piyut, and a vast number of his compositions are embodied in the festival liturgy. His style is frequently obscure. He delights in recondite allusions to the Midrash, so that one would imagine that his productions were intended for a select gathering of scholars. The form, also, is elaborate. Besides extended rhymes—they run sometimes to a whole page—he delights in alliteration and acrostics. Where words are recalcitrant, and refuse to rhyme or fit, he sometimes coins them: he makes nouns out of verbs, verbs out of nouns, and adjectives out of both. Nevertheless, he displays a vigour of treatment and a richness of language. Occasionally he grows simpler, and the thought, having some freedom from the self-imposed trammels of form, shows a loftiness of conception too often obscured. Other prominent composers were Meshullam ben Kalonymos, who lived in Italy in the second half of the tenth century, and Simeon ben Isaac ben Abun, of Mayence, of the same date. These all belonged to the eastern school, of Germany, France, and Italy. In Spain, however, the piyut took a different root, which bore a riper fruit. There Solomon ibn Gabirol (the Avicebron of the schoolmen),

---

* Berliner, p. 24.

Jehudah Halevi, and the Ibn Ezras composed hymns for the liturgy, festal, penitential, and threnic, which rank amongst the masterpieces of Hebrew literature. As examples of Ibn Gabirol's work may be cited "The Crown of Sovereignty,"* said in some congregations on the evening of the Day of Atonement, and the morning hymn, שחר אבקשך.† Jehudah Halevi's most celebrated poem is the "Ode to Zion," ציון הלא תשאלי ‡ for the fast of Ab. The use of metre is characteristic of the Spanish school. The vocabulary is simple and classical. The thought is elevated, and the style imaginative without being ornate. We can but regret that the German and Polish liturgies have not incorporated more of these poems. The Portuguese Jews have been more happy in this respect.

Amongst those who have left their mark on the liturgy are the Cabbalists, though at one time their hold on it was much greater than it now is. Heidenheim, the "Mendelssohn of the Machzor," § eliminated many of their compositions that could be spared. Their fault is an addiction to angelology, and a hyper-mysticism, which manifests itself in the endowment of certain names and numbers with potent powers. Nevertheless, there is a deep spirituality to be found in many of their prayers. They may often be recognised by the prefatory words, "Behold, I am prepared to fulfil the command of my Creator," etc. Two of such prayers may be mentioned: a morning meditation, "Behold, I take upon myself the commandment, Love thy neighbour as thyself"; and a night prayer, "Behold, I forgive everyone who has angered me or vexed me or sinned towards me, and may no one be punished for my sake."

Such have been the contributors to our prayer-book. They come from all ages and all countries. Such degree of uniformity as exists is due to the compilation and authority of the Siddurim, or prayer-books, compiled by famous Rabbis, such as R. Amram, Maimonides, and Simhah ben Samuel of Vitry. Several curious features have resulted from this process of flexible development. Variants are naturally found and they are perpetuated. So carefully have they been preserved that we frequently find instances where both versions are retained. Sometimes one version is adopted for ordinary use, while another version is reserved for special occasions. Thus the eighteenth blessing of the Amidah had two forms from a very remote period: "Who blessest Thy people Israel with peace," and "Who makest peace."* For no very intelligible reason the former version is used for everyday purposes, whilst the latter is confined to the ten Penitential Days. Sometimes both variants are recited together, e.g. the double מודים.†

---

* See Alice Lucas, *The Jewish Year*, p. 140.

† See Service of the Synagogue, Vol. I, p. 25.

‡ See Nina Salaman in *J.Q.R.* XII, 213.

§ Zunz.

Another process that we find very general is the popularisation of prayers and hymns. Though written for special days, they are afterwards employed for many other occasions. Thus the well-known prayer, עלינו,‡ was originally an introduction to the "Kingdom" verses of the New Year Additional Service, and it still retains its original place.§ In course of time, but certainly after the ninth century, it was adopted for everyday use, and was employed to conclude the morning service. Later still it became attached as the concluding prayer for every service in the Synagogue.

יגדל and אדון עולם‖ were both composed for the Day of Atonement. The latter is in Worms still sung on the evening of that fast only. The Hymns of Unity and the Hymn of Glory were originally restricted in the same way, and in their case many advocate a return to this practice. The hymn, המבדיל,¶ now sung on Saturday night, is obviously a penitential hymn taken from the Neilah Service of the Day of Atonement.

---

* Singer, p. 54.

† Singer, p. 51.

‡ Singer, pp. 76–7.

§ Singer, p. 217.

‖ pp. 2, 3.

¶ See such phrases as "He will forgive our sins," "The day declines," "Open for me the gate that is closed."

Exactly the reverse process, that of restriction, is also to be traced. Thus אין כאלהינו used to be said every day. So the יהי רצון said on the Sabbath before the New Moon was, as we have seen above, originally a daily prayer.

Some prayers have been even less fortunate; they have died altogether. Such are the extinct blessing before the Shema',[*] and the mourner's grace.[†]

Sometimes a phrase which was originally due to a mistake has become perpetuated. Thus, "And say ye Amen" at the end of the silent prayer אלהי נצור[‡] is borrowed by false analogy from the Kaddish, which concludes with the same verse. Again, the unnecessary and ungrammatical relative with which אשר בגלל אבות, the composition in praise of the Law chanted on the last day of Tabernacles, begins, is explained in a moment when we learn that it is a vestige of a blessing now fallen out of use: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who . . ."

Most common of all is the feature of expansion, to which I referred at the beginning of this article. The long list of אבינו מלכנו's seems to have grown from only two.[§] So also with regard to the על חטא's. The Siddur of R. Amram has only eight, as compared with our forty-four.[‖]

I have given only a glimpse of the wealth of this field of investigation to some to whom it may have appeared an arid desert. The prayer-book presents a striking testimony to the growth and continuity of Judaism, and a proof that whilst preserving the vital characteristics of its essence, it has been found capable of adaptation to the needs of every generation.

HERBERT M. ADLER.

---

[*] See Prof. Schechter, "Genizah Specimens," in *J.Q.R.* X, 654.

[†] Siddur of R. Amram.

[‡] Singer, p. 54.

[§] See *Taanith*, 25*b*.

[‖] Excluding the eight general על חטאים, which are common to both.

Voltaire and the Jews

By no means the least remarkable feature about Voltaire is the wide gulf between the pettiness of his personality and the grandeur of some of his ideas and his achievements. The remark of Bolingbroke, perhaps the inspirer of Voltaire's attacks on religion, that "No quality is so conspicuously absent from the conduct of philosophers as philosophy," applies with special force to Voltaire. Even his admirers, who claim for him, justly, as we think, the title of "Apostle of Tolerance" and "Herald of Freedom," are constrained to admit that his character was far from perfect.

To his enemies, who included the ultra-orthodox of all creeds, the mere mention of his name aroused disgust and abhorrence. He connoted in their minds the most brazen impudence, the most unscrupulous avarice, and the most despicable parasitism. They regarded him as the evil spirit of sardonic sarcasm, the incarnation of irreligion, and the very limit of foul-mouthed obscenity. To-day, however, when more than a century has elapsed since Voltaire's death, when the jarring noise of Voltairian controversy, which deafened the ears of contemporary Europe, has dwindled to a faint murmur, penetrating with difficulty the heavy-muffling cloak which the passing years have woven round it, a consideration of Voltaire's treatment of the Jews may enable us, aided by our knowledge of his other actions, to arrive at a calmer judgment of the man and his value.

We know of two occasions only on which Voltaire came into direct contact with Jews. The first dates back to 1727, when Voltaire found refuge in England after being driven from France for daring to consider himself

—a mere bourgeois—the equal of an aristocrat. He had a letter of credit on a Jewish banker in London. Not needing the money at once, he delayed asking for payment till some months later, only to find that the Jew had gone bankrupt three days previously. Many years later he still refers to his loss. In the *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, article "*Juifs*," he says, in his mocking way, "When Medina, your co-religionist, lost me 20,000 francs by his bankruptcy, forty-four years ago, he told me that it wasn't his fault, that he was an unfortunate man, that he had always tried to live like a son of God, that is to say, like an honest man and a good Jew. I was moved to pity and embraced him; we praised God together, and I lost 80 per cent." On the whole Voltaire bore this loss calmly, as became a disciple of the English philosophers; and this first unfortunate experience with a Jew cannot be said to have aroused his ill-will against the Jewish nation.

The second, and by far the more important of Voltaire's dealings with a Jew is the famous case of Voltaire *v.* Hirschel and Son, Berlin, 1751. Voltaire was the Grand Chamberlain of Frederick the Great, and thought he could do pretty much what he liked. As there was nothing he wanted so much as money, although he had plenty, he engaged in a discreditable speculation with a Dresden jeweller, Abraham Hirschel, and was accused of extremely dishonourable dealing, of substituting false for genuine diamonds and forging and tampering with certain documents. Though the verdict was in his favour, public opinion was decidedly against him, and through this affair he lost what to him was of the utmost worth, viz. Frederick's favour.

The King wrote to his sister just before the trial: "You ask me what case is going on between Voltaire and a Jew. It is a fight between a rogue and a knave. A man who possesses Voltaire's *esprit* should not abuse it. The matter is in the hands of Justice, and in a few days we shall know by the verdict which is the greater rogue of the two. Voltaire could not control his temper and flew at the Jew's face, he all but insulted the Chancellor Cocceji. In a word, he acted like a raving lunatic. I am waiting till the case is ended to rate him soundly (*pour lui laver la tête*), and to try if I can't make him, at fifty-six, a little less of a knave and more of a reasonable being." We are not here concerned to find out if Hirschel was more or less guilty than Voltaire. It is not necessary to defend the Jews, as some writers have done, by attempting to show that Voltaire was in the wrong on every point of this lawsuit. It is enough to understand that Voltaire was extremely incensed against Hirschel, and it is, therefore, no matter for surprise that he was thereafter bitter against Hirschel's people.

In the *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, which was begun during his stay in Berlin, his spleen is vented in the article "*Juifs.*" "Of the three races, Jews, Moslems, and Christians," he says, "the Jews are the lowest but consider themselves the highest. This pride in the midst of their misfortune is perfectly justified : Are they not the fathers of both the Moslems and the Christians ? The Christian religion and the Mohammedan both recognise the Jewish as their mother, but, by a peculiar contradiction, they hold this parent in reverence, and at the same time in abhorrence. . . . We find in them only an ignorant and barbarous people, who have long united the most sordid avarice with the most detestable superstition, and the most invincible hatred for every people by whom they are tolerated and enriched. Still, we ought not to burn them. . . ."

This attack on the Jews, however, is insignificant compared with his attack on Judaism, and especially on the Old Testament. His assault on its inspiration and its value reveals a confused and superficial learning together with the perfection of indecent raillery. Moses he calls a "charlatan—a madman deserving of Bedlam"; Gideon "a *débauché*"; Judith a "*courtisane.*" He betrayed colossal ignorance of Hebrew while pretending to know it, and to criticise the style of the Old Testament. "Hebrew," he says, "has only a future and a present tense. The remaining tenses must be guessed from the sense. . . . Each adverb has twenty different meanings. The same word has contradictory significations."

Graetz, basing his opinion of Voltaire on his anti-Jewish writings, which are undoubtedly the work of a man both prejudiced and unscientific, condemns him as utterly unscrupulous and hypocritical, and attributes his attack on Jews and Judaism to his resentment against Hirschel. He sums up his remarks by saying, "We may judge from his treatment of the Jews the sincerity of this philosopher and 'Apostle of Freedom.' He cannot have been in earnest in his tirades in favour of Freedom and Tolerance, because he turned public opinion against the nation which most needed them."

This view, which meets with the approval of the majority of both Jewish and non-Jewish critics of Voltaire, is based on a one-sided knowledge of Voltaire's character and works. He wrote otherwise of the Jews when he was his better and nobler self. "It is true, that, considering the carnage that was made under some of the Roman Emperors, and the slaughter of them so often repeated in every Christian state, it is surprising that this people not only exists, but is at the present time no less numerous than formerly. Their numbers must be attributed to their exemption from bearing arms, their custom of contracting marriage early, their law of divorce, their sober and regular way of life, their abstinence, their toil, and their exercise. Their firm attachment to the Mosaic Law is no less remarkable. . . . Judaism is now, of all religions in the world, the one most rarely abjured. This is partly due to the persecutions it has suffered. . . ." Again, "It is strange that the Christians pretend to have accomplished the prophecies by tyrannising over the Jews by whom these prophecies were transmitted." The *Sermon du Rabbin*

Akib, which he wrote as a protest against the Autodafé of September 20th, 1761, at Lisbon, when thirty-seven Jews were burnt, breathes the spirit of Tolerance. "What was their crime? Only that they were born. Their fathers begat them in the religion which their ancestors professed for the last 5000 years. They were born Israelites, they celebrated Pesach. That is the only reason that the Portuguese burnt them. . . . Would you believe that while the flames were consuming these innocent victims, the inquisitors and the other savages were chanting *our* prayers? These pitiless monsters were invoking the God of mercy and kindness, the God of pardon, while committing the most atrocious and barbarous crime, while acting in a way which demons in their rage would not use against their brother demons. . . . O ye pious tigers, ye fanatical panthers, who despise your sect so much that you have no better way of supporting it than by Executioners, if you were able to reason, I should question you, I should ask you why you sacrifice us, who are the fathers of your fathers. . . . Your madness goes so far as to say that we are scattered because our fathers condemned to death him whom you worship. Ignorant that you are. Cannot you see that it was only the Romans who condemned him? We had not, at that time, the right to inflict death; we were governed by Quirinus, Varus, Pilate, for we have, thank God, been almost always slaves. No crucifixion was practised among us. Not a trace of that form of punishment is to be found. Cease, therefore, to punish a whole nation for an event for which it cannot be responsible. . . . You admit that Jesus publicly called the Pharisees, 'Race of Vipers,' and 'Whited Sepulchres.' If one of you went through the streets of Rome calling the Pope and the Cardinals 'vipers' and 'sepulchres,' would he be allowed to continue? The Pharisees denounced him to the Roman judges, who punished him in the Roman manner. Is that a reason for burning Jewish merchants and their daughters at Lisbon? . . . If any one, leaving an Autodafé, tells me he is a Christian, I will ask him in what way. Jesus never had auricular confession, Passover was certainly not a Portuguese Custom. . . . Do you find extreme unction in the Bible? Christ made neither Cardinals nor Popes, nor Dominicans, nor Curates, nor Inquisitors. He preached only observance of the law, love of God and one's neighbour. If he reappeared to-day, would he find himself in a single one of those who call themselves Christians?

"Suppose we were once a barbarous race. What then? Would it be just to go and burn the Pope and all the Monsignori at Rome to-day, because the first Romans ravished the Sabines and pillaged the Samnites? . . . Let each one serve God in the religion to which he is born, without desiring to tear out the heart of his neighbour by useless disputes. Let each one serve his King and his Country, and never use the pretence of serving God to disobey the Laws. O God, who hast created us all, who desirest not the misfortune of thy Creatures, God, father of all, God of Mercy, accomplish thou that there be no longer on this globe, on this least of all the worlds, either fanatics or persecutors. Amen."

The man who could speak thus cannot have been the unscrupulous hypocrite which his enemies would make him out. We must recollect, also, that these words were written at a time when the persecuting Catholic Church was supreme in Europe, when the Ghetto walls were not yet broken down, when elementary human rights were denied to Jews. Only here and there did any one have the boldness to raise his voice on behalf of the persecuted race. Voltaire, Montesquieu, Lessing, Locke, and Toland were among the few noble spirits who dared offend the all-powerful Church. It was still the reign of authority, of blind obedience to the Church. Voltaire, more than any of the others, brought about the downfall of the "Infâme," that is, the spirit of authority, tyranny, fanaticism. It was his life's task to crush the "Infâme." Reading his attacks on Judaism in the light of this task, we perceive that spite against Hirschel could not have been the sole or even chief cause of those attacks. He realised that to be successful in his war against the principle of blind obedience in religion (which in those days meant Roman Catholicism) he must attack it from its very foundation. Hence his fierce attack on the Old Testament, and his continual harping on the Jewish religion as the Mother of Mohammedanism and Christianity. The darts levelled at Judaism were nearly always intended for Christianity.

If he could prove that the Jewish legends were borrowed, the blow would fall on Christianity, which is based on the inspiration of the Bible. When he disregards this consideration, his account of the Jews can be, as we have seen, very sympathetic indeed. But even his attacks on Jews were not without good fruit, since they called forth several gallant defenders of the Jewish race and faith. Of these only one was a Jew. Isaac de Pinto replied to Voltaire's strictures on the Jews in a pamphlet entitled, *Réflexions Critiques sur le premier Chapître du Septième tôme des œuvres de M. de Voltaire* (Paris, 1763). The origin of these *Reflections*, as is seen from a letter written by a certain Guasco, a Portuguese Jew of London, to the Rev. Mr. Sweetmind, Canon of Winchester, is to be found in the dispute at Bordeaux between the Portuguese Jews and the German Jews. The latter wished to enjoy the same privileges as the former, who resented this demand. The Sefardim numbered the most influential Jews on their side, and succeeded in getting their brethren expelled the city. This aroused great attention, and the Portuguese community considered it necessary to explain their position. A suitable opportunity was afforded by Voltaire's attack.

Pinto's *Reflections* are very moderate in tone. After speaking of the fatal consequences of calumny and quoting Voltaire's attack ending with the words, "Still we ought not to burn them," de Pinto continues: "Let me say in all humility to M. de Voltaire that many of those whom he treats so cruelly would rather be burnt than deserve these gratuitous imputations." Voltaire, he writes, should have distinguished the Spanish and Portuguese from other Jews. "M. de Voltaire cannot be unaware of the absolute division which prevents Spanish and Portuguese from uniting, either by marriage or otherwise, with Jews of other nations. . . . Their separation from their brethren is so great that if a Portuguese Jew married a German Jewess he would immediately lose all his privileges, the synagogue would refuse to admit him as a member, he would be excluded from Ecclesiastical and Civil offices, he would be entirely cut off from the body of the nation and would not even be allowed to receive burial among his Portuguese brethren." De Pinto then gives a glowing account of the Portuguese community of Amsterdam. "There is scarcely a single example of a Jew being convicted of any crime at Amsterdam or the Hague for two centuries. As for the Jews of Germany and Poland, he admits their inferiority, but attributes it to persecution and contempt. "The scorn which is heaped on them stifles in them the germs of virtue and honour."

The *Reflections* were sent to Voltaire by the author together with a flattering letter to which Voltaire replied as follows: "Sir, the lines of which you complain are, in truth, violent and unjust. There are very learned and very honourable men among you. Your letter is convincing proof. When one has committed an error, it must be corrected, and I was wrong to credit a whole nation with the vices of a few of its members." He continued, however, to repeat many of his accusations. The *Reflections* were well received by the learned world, and induced some very sensible remarks in the *Monthly Review* of 1763. "If the ingenious author of this apology for the Jews had not made so great a distinction between those of the Portuguese and Dutch nations, he might have been esteemed a candid, as he is otherwise a polite and able advocate. But there is something too partial and invidious, however just, in that distinction to entitle him to the honour of being the Defender of the Jewish people in general. If Mr. de Voltaire thinks himself to blame in having imputed to a whole nation the vices of several individuals, our Apologist must be in a great degree equally guilty for shifting off the burthen from the shoulders of his own party, the Portuguese and Spaniards, and leaving it on those of the Poles and Germans, who, so far as they are Jews, are probably no worse than their brethren."

A more successful refutation of Voltaire's attacks on the Old Testament was achieved by the *Lettres de Quelques Juifs Allemands et Polonais* (Lisbon and Paris, 1769), which ran through several editions. These letters are signed Joseph Lopez, Isaac Montenero, Benjamin Groot, etc., Jews of the neighbourhood of Utrecht. They are, however, really the work of the Abbé Guenée, a professor of a college in Paris, who cleverly held up to ridicule Voltaire's ignorance of the Old Testament, and drew from him the admission that the words of the "Jewish Secretary" were "like biting fangs which drew blood." Guenée combats flippancy by argument, superficial knowledge by profound learning, and cynical exaggeration by temperate rebuke. Step by step, through three volumes, he wrestles with his opponent, throwing him time after time, until any other than Voltaire would have remained silent. Voltaire, however, could not bear defeat, and replied with more obscenity and more shallow philosophy. An example of the Abbé's style may not be without interest. Voltaire, in writing against the authenticity of the Bible, had mentioned the names of Jewish and other critics, Abenezra, Spinosa, Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, Toland, etc., who, he maintained, had similar views. Guenée comments:

"When a writer is desirous of attacking generally accepted opinions, and has no strong argument to bring forward, he often resorts to an adroit display of imposing authorities. There is less risk of being compromised if one hides in the shadows of great names, and the attacks seem to have a great advantage, at least for a time and in the eyes of certain readers. Such, My Dear Sir, was no doubt your intention when you quoted the long list of celebrated writers to whom you attribute the arguments which you employ and whom you say you have only copied. We hesitate to affirm that you have never looked at the works of these savants, but we say openly that either you have not understood the opinion of the majority of them or you have wilfully misrepresented them. At the very least, you do not speak of them with that accuracy which one has the right to expect from a writer such as you."

The conclusion is very remarkable as coming from a Christian pen. "Finally, Sir, every portion of the Mosaic Law reveals the profound, the divine wisdom of the lawgiver; its dogmas are reasonable and sublime, its religious and moral precepts pure and holy, its political, military, and civil laws sound, equitable, and charitable, and even its ritual laws based on reason. In this legal system there is nothing against nature or virtue: everything breathes the spirit of piety, justice, honesty, and charity. Its aim, its antiquity, its origin, its duration, the qualities and virtue of the lawgiver, the respect of so many people all go to prove its excellence. Your greatest men have admired it, and have regarded it as the source of all human and divine justice, and you, Sir, call it absurd and barbaric."

No reply was possible, but Voltaire added another section to his article on Jews in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, in which he expanded some of his previous absurdities. He could never bring himself to acknowledge that he was beaten; and worsted in argument he replied with sarcasm. "We have been accustomed for ages to hang you up between two dogs; we have repeatedly pulled your teeth through our avarice, we have times without number driven you out and then recalled you through our avarice and folly: we still, in more towns than one, make you pay for the liberty of breathing the air; we have in more kingdoms than one sacrificed you to God; we have burnt you as holocausts. . . . You were monsters of cruelty and fanaticism in Palestine; we have been so in Europe. My friends, let us forget all that. Do you wish to live in peace? . . . Then be silent. . . . You are calculating animals. Try to be thinking ones." Yet here again, through the prejudice and partiality against the Jews, the object of attack is seen to be Christian intolerance and fanaticism.

Sufficient has been said to reveal Voltaire's opinion of the Jews. What, we ask, shall be the Jewish opinion of Voltaire? and how comes it that the Apostle of Tolerance was himself intolerant, and the enemy of Prejudice himself prejudiced against the Jews? We have already hinted that we cannot accept the simple solution suggested by Graetz. We cannot believe that the man who alone in all Europe raised his voice on behalf of Admiral Byng, the man who defended by deeds as well as words the cause of the widow and the fatherless, who helped the workmen of Geneva and the farmers of Ferney, was nothing more than a consummate hypocrite, shedding tears in public and laughing mockingly in private at the dupes whom he deceived. The difficulty of accounting for Voltaire's treatment of the Jews is but a single instance of a much wider and far more difficult problem, the problem of Voltaire's true character.

It may be suggested that there were two Voltaires—that is to say, that we have in Voltaire a remarkable example of dual personality. The two Voltaires which were linked together in the wizened but active body of François Arouet offer a strange contrast. When the worse is in control, Voltaire is either quarrelling or grumbling, insulting somebody or indulging in fawning and sickening flattery, engaged in shady financial transactions or puffing his own works, slandering or spying. To this Voltaire must be ascribed, for instance, the undignified behaviour at Berlin, the quarrels with Rousseau, the perpetual lying and disavowal of his own works. This man possessed in folio the vices which most of us have in duodecimo, and of him Mendelssohn justly said, "Diesem Manne ist nichts heilig." There was another Voltaire, however, which dwelt alongside the first and grew more and more powerful with advancing years. By far the best years of Voltaire's life are the last twenty or thirty, when as "The Patriarch of Ferney" his name was the symbol of independence and the rallying cry in the fight for freedom. It was he who admired the freedom of England, who took under his sheltering wing the unfortunate of every land, who dared to call out for justice in a world of corruption, for tolerance in a land of fanaticism, and for freedom of the Press in a country of the censor.

Believing, however, as he did, that Judaism was the basis of Christianity, which he had set himself to overthrow because he saw in it the origin of all the bigotry and intolerance in Europe, it is not astonishing to find in him a bitter enemy of the Jews' religion, and incapable of distinguishing the virtues of the object attacked. Yet the Jews are greatly indebted to Voltaire. If they receive to-day equitable and just treatment in West European lands, if the ferocious fanaticism of a Jesuitical Church seems hard to imagine, and an Autodafé impossible, Voltaire is to be thanked in large measure. He fought single-handed for many years on behalf of Justice and Tolerance. Perhaps the better Voltaire alone could not have accomplished what the spiteful malevolence, the biting, stinging sarcasm and blasphemous irreverence of the worse were able to do. A monster cannot be slain by aught but swinging blows.

Could the shade of the better Voltaire, freed from its twin-brother, cast a glance over the world to-day he would find in the condition of the Jews much to surprise him, a little to console, but more to make him sad. He would see with amazement, in the land whence sprang " l'Infâme "—the evil spirit of a tyrannous and bigoted Church—a Jew as Premier, and in the very city of Papal " Infallibility " a Jewish Mayor. In other lands he would see Jews in the very highest positions, and held in the greatest respect. He would rejoice to see that the good seed he had sown—the seed of Right—was bearing tardy fruit; that the fight he had fought, the fight for freedom, had not been in vain. One land would sorely trouble him, a land darkened with the cloud of impending revolution, where Jews have still to pay dearly for the crime of being born, where pogroms have taken the place of Autodafés. We can imagine what Voltaire would have written against the barbarity of Russia. His bitterest attacks on the Roman Catholic Church would be as the gentle dew of heaven compared to the shower of condemnation which he would have poured forth in hissing, scorching epithets upon the Holy Synod and its ways.

Perhaps a second Voltaire will arise to do in our time what the first did for his generation, to fight against injustice and hasten the coming of freedom.

S. Landman.

The Ghetto Alms Collector

A poem from the Yiddish of J. L. Perez

Translated by Helena Frank

For thirty years a sight well known to all he's been,
With mournful face and dim old eyes, the same
He passes day by day ; they know his tall, bowed frame,
They know his long, thin beard, and locks of silver sheen,
His threadbare kaftan too (he's worn it, who can tell
How long ?—a second skin) is known to all the street.
They know his swaying gait, they know his step full well,
The shuffle of his sore and all but shoeless feet.
For others, not himself, his labour he pursues,
Altho' the saying runs : "They have no hearts, these Jews ! "

In all the meaner streets his name's a household word,
He's in and out the puddle that splashes to his knees,
The rattle of his box is daily to be heard,
He shakes it as he goes, " A farthing, if you please ! "
He begs not of the rich for silver or for gold,
For poverty with poverty he pleads, a Jew with Jews.
But near fine folk he goes not, he dare not make so bold,
He begs for pence and half-pence—who is there will refuse ?
Jews drop in their pennies—no one says him nay,
Tho' many a time and oft : " Jews cannot feel ! " men say.

From attic then to cellar he passes very quickly,
And still the poor man's gift among the poor divides.
Where need and squalor dwell, and men deformed and sickly,
Where children wail and fret with hunger—in he glides.
Where scarce the widow dares for shame stretch forth a hand,
Where joy's last trembling spark was quenched in want and care,
Where orphans succourless and unprotected stand,
There of his slender store he gives to each a share.
His words are always few ; for thanks he will not stay,
Tho' many a time and oft : " Jews cannot feel ! " men say.

And then he comes again—he goes from door to door,
And seeks for honest work, and still among the poor.
Now he twists a rope, or else a handle turns,
The bellows now he blows, beside a press bent double
He squeezes acid fruit, and thus, with toil and trouble,
But self-dependent still, his livelihood he earns.
And sometimes of his box you think he'll lift the lid,
And take thence for himself one kopeck—God forbid!
He's kept himself in food and lodging day by day,
Tho' many a time and oft: "Jews cannot feel!" men say.

Dark falls, and in the inn he sits through half the night,
O'er his tattered Bible bends a weary head,
A farthing dip beside him, a plate of beans, and bread.
People laugh and tease him—he looks not left or right.
Tipsy are the people—let them go their ways!
Now his face grows sadder, wistful is his gaze.
He cares not who's beside him, cares not who carouses,
He is far beyond them, far from public-houses!
His thoughts are very distant, with Zion's hill are they,
Tho' many a time and oft: "Jews cannot feel!" men say.

He's known to young and old, he's known to all the town,
He's known in all the streets and alleys up and down;
And, "in a hundred years and twenty," for the right
To bear his corpse, the townsfolk will struggle, push and fight,
And beards will fly like mad, the grizzled, black and red,
The people to his grave will follow him in tears,
And soil of Palestine they'll scatter o'er his head,
And keep his mem'ry green through all the coming years.
And for a grave to pay full high they'll not refuse,
Although the saying runs: "They have no hearts, these Jews!"

Reviews of Books

Zur Geschichte der Juden im Vierten Jahrhundert. Dr. Leopold Lucas, Glogau (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden.* Teil I.) Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1910.

The fourth century is of such importance in the history of religion that we must welcome any work which deals with the fortunes of Judaism during that period, even though Judaism contributed but little, directly, to the main religious development of the fourth-century Empire. Judaism had exerted its greatest influence on the Roman paganism in the early years of the Empire, when the whole religious conception was changing, when the first steps were being taken towards that syncretism, which is already to be found in popular guise in Apuleius, and which was to take its more philosophic and complete shape in such works as the religious orations of Julian, or parts of the Saturnalia of Macrobius. Here it was that the acquaintance which Greek and Roman had for centuries with Jewish monotheism, and the admiration in which they held it, were to prepare the way for the worship of the later Empire. It was not the mere fashionable Judaism mocked at by the satirists, but that system and unity that made philosophers identify the Pythagorean and Mosaic teaching, which was of account in the history of Roman religion. What the other oriental cults supplied in mystery and extravagance, the Jews gave in earnestness, and their conception of the Unity of God. The objection which the Jews had to being involved in this imperial system of religion put a limit to the direct influence of Jew upon pagan. We may place the end of the story as occurring in the reign of the Syrian Alexander Severus, the eclectic, who put statues of Abraham and Christ amongst his collection of the great prophets. By the fourth century Judaism is of little importance except to the Jews.

Dr. Lucas has practically confined himself to two points in the study of this epoch: the attitude of the Christian Fathers towards Judaism, and the general trend of imperial policy towards the Jews. The latter would seem to be the more important of the two, and he has rightly expended the more elaborate part of the work upon it, but he has failed to see a curious contradiction between these two subjects; or rather, whilst the contradiction is evident in his pages, he has failed to make sufficient note of it. The Empire was for the greater part of the fourth century nominally, at least, Christian; the Christian writings of the age are full of bitter and extreme attacks upon the Jews, and yet the general treatment of the Jew was mild and tolerant. True, he suffered a few disabilities, as, for instance, in the case of military service and judicial appointments, but yet his peculiar privileges were for the most part respected and maintained, and in a period in which the Emperor was nominally prosecuting a policy of rigid uniformity, the Jewish faith was given a freedom which it was rarely to possess in later days. Had Dr. Lucas sought to account for this contradiction, he might have escaped the worst fault of his book, the absolute and uncritical faith which he reposes in the statements of even the most rhetorical of the Christian Fathers. Nor, again, has he any regard for the multiplicity of opinions held about the Jews by others, of no less importance than a Basil or an Augustine, though perhaps not sharing the same fame or sanctity. The world did not consist, in the fourth century, of Jews on the one side, and Christians, either schismatic or virulent, on the other, and none others; some attention might have been bestowed upon the poets and philosophers, and in general upon the politer side of life and literature.

The few members of the old conservative party who still existed, the men who were to lead the last pagan revival under the puppet Emperor Eugenius, viewed Jew and Christian alike with equal disdain; the well-known lines of Rutilius are based on Seneca, and the general type of criticism was hardly distinct from that made by Tacitus three centuries earlier. With the Emperors this was not the case; whilst they acknowledged the Christian faith, they were still chary of open acts of violence towards old religions, and, above all, towards Judaism, which had always been the recipient of special privileges, and which, in their deafness to the rhetoric of the Fathers, they must always have regarded as the foundation upon which their own faith was first built. Hence, if the destruction of paganism was to be accomplished, after one century had elapsed, in the reign of Valentinian III, how much more cautious must the Emperors have been in their treatment of the Jews. Constantius, the pupil of Firmicus Maternus, and the author of severe anti-pagan edicts, whose invectives against the heathens still survive, was yet sufficiently Roman in his pride to distribute the great priesthoods which had been the rewards of honour in the centuries of the Republic. Can we be surprised, then, that the Emperors dealt mildly with the Jews, that they were accused of Judaising themselves, and that over-bold preachers are recorded to have attacked them to their faces for this fault? The Fathers used the most furious and violent language when they condemned the Jews; their bitterness was not that possessed by the old pagan, who viewed with mistrust the nation which wasted one day out of every seven, which was unsociable, the enemy of all mankind except itself; rather, their hatred was an extreme development of one doctrine of the Pauline Christianity, and a protest against the sects which still attempted, in various degrees, to unite Jewish and Christian beliefs. But it is easy to overestimate the value of such invectives for historical purposes. Dr. Lucas seeks to argue mainly from them a close union between Jew and Heretic, he seeks to prove a great proselytising movement on the part of the Jews in the fourth century, and he regards Judaism as signalled out for even harder treatment by the orthodox divines than the heathen religions themselves. We doubt if these positions are tenable. It is true, indeed, that we possess certain laws, which are directed jointly against Jew and schismatic, it is also true that the Fathers reproach the Jews for their alliance with the enemies of the true branch of the Church; again, Arian Emperors are less severe upon the Jews than those of orthodox faith. But this is not sufficient evidence to support Dr. Lucas. It is only natural that the Arians should treat the Jews with some respect; Arianism and Judaism were not so far away, and the two had the bond of one common enemy. But the actual record of definite union between Jew and Donatist, or Arian, is only to be found in the prejudiced pages of Christian writers, or in the histories which are based upon them.

The evidence for Jewish proselytism is of a very similar nature. The fact that there are general laws against such activity on the part of the Jews is hardly sufficient to justify our maintaining that the Jews were busy in this direction. The charge would usually rest rather upon those Christians who still held to the Jewish law, and whom the imperial courts might easily class along with the Jew proper; it was the invidious task of the orthodox writer to seek to effect some such confusion. Such sects were attacked by Augustine and Hieronymus, and the confusion of Jews and Hypsistæ can well be paralleled at an earlier date by the confusion of Judaism and the worship of Sabazius, a non-Semitic worship containing, however, many imported Jewish traits. That there was any closer union between Jew and Judaiser we can hardly believe, nor is there any need to suppose that there was such, if we recollect the very high note upon which the greater part of the Patristic literature of the time is pitched. This is quite sufficient to account for the very slender evidence upon which it is sought to prove a new age of Jewish proselytism. Further, Jews, as was seen, were receiving special terms at the time when all heathen religions were being crushed. Does this accord with Dr. Lucas's thesis that Christian effort was being specially directed against the Jews ? We have only to call to mind the heat and intensity of Clement of Alexandria, of Arnobius, and all the other writers who attacked paganism, to realise that whilst the Jews are treated with general criticism, which is thus of little weight, the pagan religions are exposed in the most highly coloured terms, in a manner as disgusting as it is elaborate and detailed. The contradiction between imperial policy and Christian writings, so far as it can be solved, must be solved by a toning down of the latter ; we must not, as Dr. Lucas has done, fail to realise that the Fathers did not mean quite all that they said, and that the Jews did not receive such bad treatment as, for instance, the worshippers of the mysteries.

It is to be hoped that in the next volume of the series, which Dr. Lucas promises will deal with the same period, we may see some attempt to describe the characteristics of Jewish Society in the fourth century. The present volume contains a few hints which show that such a work is certainly possible, and Dr. Lucas has such a wide knowledge of the authorities of the age that we might well expect him to devote himself to the subject.

WILFRID M. LANGDON.

The Religious Teaching of Jesus. By C. G. Montefiore. Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 2s. 6d.

THIS book contains the Jowett Lectures delivered by Mr. Montefiore in 1909 at the Passmore Edwards Settlement, before an audience consisting of Jews and Christians. Mr. Montefiore's general standpoint is that of Liberal Judaism, but it would be equally correct to say that his views coincide with those current among English Christian Unitarians. A word of praise is undoubtedly due to the author for his defence of the law (p. 31), which, he says, was a "popular law, observed and cared for by the nation at large." Again the spirited criticism of the New Testament caricature of the Pharisees (p. 37) will meet with well-deserved sympathy. "What single word best describes the sort of man Jesus of Nazareth really was?" Mr. Montefiore replies that Jesus was a prophet (p. 14)—aye, more than a prophet (p. 124), who came to believe himself to be the Messiah. Mr. Montefiore frequently notes with complacent satisfaction that the teaching of Jesus transcended the law. He was inspired, so the author thinks, just because he abrogated several laws, e.g. divorce, ritual laws dealing with food, etc. Mr. Montefiore grants that in the inevitable conflict that ensued between the Rabbis and Jesus, the former were "dialectically in the right." "But," he immediately points out, "we can also perceive that Jesus was in the right too, and that his right was higher and more permanent than the dialectical right of the Rabbis" (p. 42). Jesus, however, himself repudiated the title of prophet at Cæsarea Philippi. Nor did Israel look forward to a Messiah who would bring a new law to them (*Joma*, 80*a*). This was, indeed, to be the desire of the Gentiles (Isa. xi. 10) (see *Gen. Rab.* § 98). According to the Siphra (*Bechukothai*, p. 112*a*) God raises up prophets among the Gentiles, who will teach them and bring them beneath the wings of the Heavenly Father. If, then, Jesus had a new law, and was also a prophet, it was not in *Israel* that his mission was needed. Mr. Montefiore has a remarkable way of softening down the stupendous claims of Jesus—either the verse is a later edition (see p. 163, where even Harnack's acceptance of Matt. xi. 27 is rejected), or else it *ought* not to be quoted as evidence, because we have the opinion not of Jesus, but of the editor (Mark ii. 7) (see p. 162, and also Matt. xi. 25, on p. 160); or finally it means something else, and must not be taken literally. Thus, on p. 104, Jesus' demand for faith in himself is excused on the ground that "his demand for faith in his divine Father ran over into a demand for faith in himself. The greater, to him, included the less." Mr. Montefiore grants that "Gehenna filled an important place in the thoughts and teaching of Jesus" (p. 69), but, in spite of the prophetic and divine insight that he attributes to Jesus, he dismisses the disagreeable problem with the words: "But the motive was not original to Jesus; therefore its consideration need no longer detain us." If Jews apply this criterion to the genuine teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels, they will be justified in ignoring his teaching because it lacks *original* motives which appeal to the Jew as true and good. It seems to us that the only possible Jewish estimate of Jesus is that he was one of many self-deluded Messiahs who adopted the apocalyptic style of teaching, which has never appealed to the genuine soul of Israel. If Dr. Kohler prefers to class him among the Essenes, for which there is undoubtedly *some* justification (*Systemat. Theologie des Judentums*, p. 318), the criticism that he is therefore not truly representative of Jewish sentiment still holds good. Mr. Montefiore completely ignores the *Jewish* standpoint in his estimate of Jesus. It is the result of unconscious bias that leads him to say in contrasting the teaching of Jesus with that of the Rabbis on the question of the Fatherhood of God: "That God's fatherhood was largely limited to Israel is true. . . . To Jesus, on the other hand, it is true that God was his father, and the father of those to whom he spoke and among whom he lived, in virtue of a common *humanity*. The element of race and nationality seemed to fade away" (p. 92). This view is untrue and is likely to mislead many readers of the book. There is, first of all, the fact which Mr. Montefiore ignores, that Jesus alone, according to the Gospels, looked upon God as his Father not "in virtue of his *humanity*," but by reason of his divinity. Secondly, God was only, through the revelation of Jesus, the Father of those who became the brothers and sisters of Jesus, i.e. who obeyed him and had faith in him. We cannot say that Harnack is wrong in thinking that the following is one of the genuine sayings of Jesus: "All was delivered unto me by my Father; and no man knoweth the Son except the Father; neither knoweth any the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son would reveal him" (Matt. xi. 27). We quite agree that here we "find the beginning of that mournful Christian particularism," which denies all knowledge of God except to those who believe in Jesus (p. 163). The Jewish conception of God as the Father has fortunately never known such a particularism. Philo and Josephus speak of God, again and again, as the "Father of all." God is called by Israel, *King of the Universe*, and He is also *Father of all* who inhabit the Universe. It is just in such discussions that Mr. Montefiore seems to be under the spell of Bousset, Harnack, or Sanday, who lay so much stress on Jesus' originality in revealing God as the Father. Mr. Montefiore believes in the existence of a "submerged tenth" in Israel to whom Jesus made his appeal (p. 160). The people to whom Jesus is said to have appealed, however (the tax-collectors and the fishermen, who followed him), did not belong to the submerged tenth, if such a class really existed.

In speaking on the question of divorce, reference is made to "Rabbi Shammai" (p. 45). The Talmud only knows this teacher as "Shammai." There were some teachers who did not love the title of "Rabbi," and who consequently would not tally with the description of Jesus, who charged the scribes with this very fault. Mr. Montefiore is mistaken in saying that Shammai "declared that divorce must be limited to adultery" (p. 45). This was the opinion of *Beth Shammai*, i.e. the school of Shammai. Jesus undoubtedly in the Sermon on the Mount follows this opinion, but as Mr. Montefiore points out, this was not Jesus' real view. "He declared himself against all divorce whatever and on whatever ground." The Church in Protestant countries has not followed the teaching of Jesus, but, with a deeper insight into the needs of human society, has followed the teaching of the Rabbis who belonged to the school of Shammai. We cannot then really speak of Jesus' "championship of womanhood" (p. 45), any more than Jews can speak of this virtue as distinguishing the school of Shammai. In conclusion, we cordially endorse every word of the following passage: "I will only add that to the modern Jew (who is a passionate universalist) no teacher whose reported words are so thickly strewn with allusions to Gehenna, and to the devil, and to the way that leads to destruction and to permanent interdiction from everlasting life, can be regarded without the most grave and serious criticism" (p. 152).

GERALD FRIEDLANDER.

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. pp. xiv–239. London: Elliot Stock. 3s. 6d.

BACON'S dictum that "a little philosophy inclineth men's minds to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion," is particularly verified in the field of Biblical criticism, where new knowledge long relied on the little learning which is a dangerous thing. The destructive theories of its early stages fall successively before the repeated confirmations which conservative faith receives from recent archæological discoveries, which hold out the promise that in the final result the walls of our fort will but be moved forward. Jews have, however, taken small part in the renewal of our defences, a fact which renders Mr. Wiener's work so much the more welcome. So far, Dr. D. Hoffman's *Leviticus* is the only Jewish work of note that attempts to answer the conclusions of the Higher Critics; but his reliance on Rabbinical etiology does not enable him to meet them on their own ground. This Mr. Wiener endeavours to do and it is well that at a time when Jews are beginning to contribute fruitful studies on New Testament problems a Jew should be found to meet Christian critics on the problems of the Old Testament.

Free from all theological prejudices, Mr. Wiener is none the less unable to accept the apologetics that would justify literary forgeries in Holy Scripture; and his anger sometimes finds vent in harsh personal judgments. His case is strong enough to justify the calmness born of confidence, and a change in tone may win more of the attention for which he pleads. The force of his logic and thoroughness of his research should give to Higher Critics a new view-point on their own ground. And the enthusiasm of the discoverer must pardon the occasional vehemence of his language. It is remarkable evidence of the Jewish love of freedom in thought that the first questioning of the traditional account of Biblical authorship—apart from the Talmudic discussions before the tradition was formed—is found in the work of a Rabbinic commentator, from whom, too, we learn that Spinoza was not the first Jew who questioned the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. And modern Higher Criticism is also to be traced to Jewish origin in the work of the surgeon Jean Astruc, whose theory as to late documentary sources underlying our Pentateuch is the basis of modern exegesis and Biblical theology.

Mr. Wiener may claim to be the first effective Jewish critic of the critics, and he seeks to create a new point of view. In his *Studies in Biblical Law* he brought his legal training to bear on the exposition of Pentateuchal legislation. In the volume before us he continues his defence of the Mosaic authorship of the narratives of the Pentateuch with the same lucidity and absence of technicalities that bring his information within reach of the *grand public*. Everything is to be gained by emphasising the organic unity in singleness of purpose and the harmony in varying content of the legal and narrative portions of the Pentateuch. Archæology comes to our aid by proving it feasible that Moses was himself the harmoniser of earlier traditions, whether embodied in documents or orally preserved. Mr. Wiener does not attempt to prove the absence of " sources " to the Pentateuch—

an attempt which were as futile as needless—but he does prove the impossibility of tracing them and the injustice of post-dating them. We thus learn the weakness of the foundations of expositions and Biblical histories based on them. A Jewish surgeon is responsible for the dissection of the Law which is our life, and it is well that a Jewish lawyer devotes himself to the repair of the damage wrought; for a lawyer is as qualified as a philologist to treat of the problems of the Torah.

The Legends of the Jews. By Louis Ginzberg. Translated from the German Manuscript by Henrietta Szold. II. Bible Stories and Characters from Joseph to the Exodus. pp. 375. The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1910.

It is remarkable that there should be appearing simultaneously in Russia and the United States editions of the great store of Jewish legend, systematically arranged, and brought within the understanding of the ordinary layman. Byalik's *Sifre Agadah* gives a Hebrew rendering of the material, and thus presents it in a form attractive to those interested in the Hebrew revival, and Professor Ginzberg, with the help of Miss Szold, is bringing it to the knowledge of the ever-growing Jewish community for which English is the vernacular tongue. This second volume of his work contains the stories and legends which are centred around the Biblical narrative from the life of Joseph to the end of the book of Exodus. So full and complete is the collection that the author expects in his next volume only to cover the rest of the legends which deal with Moses. Some twenty pages in the book contain the Midrash about Job; since "legend is above time and space," the editor has placed Job where legend placed him, between the period of Jacob and Moses. The only unsatisfactory feature about the arrangement is that the sources of, and comments upon, all the legends are reserved for the last volume of the entire work, so that at present the student is left in the dark as to the origin or date of any particular story, and may not be enlightened for several years. But for what we have we should be very grateful to the Jewish Publication Society and the editor and translator, and for what we are still to receive not less grateful.

Die Entdeckungsreise des Herrn Dr. Theodor Lessing zu den Ostjuden. Von Benjamin Segel. Verlag Hatikwa: Lemberg, 1910. 1 Mark.

Treitschke, one of the most intellectual and refined of the Teuton anti-Semites, wrote some thirty years ago:—"There is only too much dirt and coarseness in this movement (anti-Semitism), and one cannot keep down one's loathing when one notices that several of these scurrilous writings come openly from Jewish pens; it is notorious that since the time of Pfefferkorn and Eisenmenger men who were born Jews have played a large part among the fanatical Jew-baiters." Perhaps the bitterest fruit of Jewish persecution is this demoralisation of the weaker Jewish brethren, which turns them into the enemies and maligners of their own people; and as the writer of this striking pamphlet shows, this loss of all racial respect, and of all decency, is becoming increasingly common among a certain class of semi-cultured German and Russian Jews. Mr. Segel is especially concerned with a very developed specimen of the class, one Dr. Theodor Lessing, who made a voyage of exploration to the ghettos of Galicia, and published the results of his remarkable researches, extending over a few weeks, and embracing the whole Eastern Jewry, in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums,* which is edited in Berlin by Dr. Ludwig Geiger. With delightful sarcasm and remorseless analysis, the writer dissects the report of this very special correspondent, and if after a time he seems to be flogging the slain, he holds the attention throughout, because he is exposing not the misrepresentations and banalities of an individual, but the crookedness of a widespread outlook. The occidentalised Jew of the type of Dr. Lessing regards it as a brilliant manifestation of his emancipation and of his newly acquired culture to despise his old inheritance, to look down upon his benighted brethren, to point the broadest possible contrast between Western and Eastern Jews, and at the same time to pose as one possessed of a deep and intimate knowledge of all his brethren, and to profess a sweeping and indubitable philosophy of their degeneration. The method is simple. He finds some low individual, who reveals the infamies of the community, and straightway this man becomes the type, and his misdeeds, actual or reported, are ascribed to the six millions of Eastern Jews. With the aid of plenty of local colour the method is convincing—to the assimilated Jew, who is not unwilling to believe evil of his poorer brethren. Occasionally, indeed, with reprehensible carelessness, or it may be ignorance, the local colour is falsely applied, as when Dr. Lessing tells how he visited the Great Synagogue at Cracow one Friday evening, and found a packed congregation sitting there in Tephillin and Talithim, those horrid survivals of an Oriental superstition, which, however, are not usually visible on a Friday night. Perhaps what is saddest and also most ludicrous in the attitude of the Jewish anti-Semite, is the withering contempt he, as a good Germanised Russian Jew, has for the Eastern Jew; he forgets that not a century ago the Sefardim expressed the same contempt for the German Jew! In England, indeed, we are to a large extent free from this unnatural and unfounded cleavage between the two sections of the Jewish people, but we are confronted with a more local but not less unnatural distinction between East-end and West-end Jews. This pamphlet of Mr. Segel should therefore have a wide appeal here; every page of it is entertaining, and at the same time speaks a large knowledge of, and sympathy for, the Jewish masses; and as the poison may have reached far, we hope that the antidote will reach still further.

Egypt and the Egyptians,. By the Rev. J. O. Bevan, M.A., F.G.S., etc. pp. xxiii–324. London: George Allen & Sons. 5s. net.

Mr. Bevan gives us an extension of previously recorded impressions of his visit to Egypt in company with other members of the British Association on their return from Cape Town. The visit served to focus previous knowledge, which is vividly presented to give an interesting survey of the achievements of scholarship in revealing Egypt's contribution to the progress of civilisation, and the work of civilisation in Egypt. In twenty-six short chapters her present features and the monuments of her past are made to tell their tale of the social conditions, political relations, and changing beliefs of fleeting centuries, from before the sojourn of Abraham to the visits of Professors Sayce and Petrie. The author assumes a wide range of interest in his readers, and he sustains it. He addresses himself to a popular audience, and gives detailed information in an entertaining manner, so that he who runs may read as if he had studied and seen with Mr. Bevan and his companions.

AP
92
J65
v.1
no.1-3

The Jewish review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY